CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

THE MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

Nos. 1, 2 & 3. APRIL—JUNE, 1943. Vol. XXXIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

Towards the New Reformation.

In a world characterised on the one hand by religious reaction extending from Brazil to Magdalen College, Oxford, and on the other hand by anti-Christian totalitarianism extending from Berlin to Tokyo, it is cheering to hear the bugle-calls of a sane Christian Liberalism summoning those who do not despair of the Christian Republic to go forward with the work of the New Reformation.

Dean Inge in an article entitled 'A New Reformation' in the *Hibbert Journal* for April, 1943, asks: 'What are my hopes for a new Reformation?' He answers:

> 'First, humanism, science, and the reformed Churches need no longer be enemies. There is no reason why they should not co-operate against vulgarity, materialism, faithless scepticism, and superstition. The Churches must frankly admit, as ministers of religion, those who attach a symbolical value to the traditional miracles of Christianity, though there will, I think, be no wish to prevent simple faith from speaking its own language. . . .'
>
> 'Next, we must be more than content to incorporate in our religion our best national ideals.'
>
> 'Thirdly, . . . we need a revival of Puritanism. . . . Disraeli's criticism that "we have mistaken comfort for civilization" must not be forgotten.'

The Dean's optimism—a union of hope and fear—does not extend to the Church. He concludes his article with these words:

> 'An Erasmian Reformation, to follow the Lutheran Reformation of 400 years ago! Yes, that is what we should like to see; humanism, science, even politics, if such a thing were possible, brought into willing captivity to the obedience of Christ. But who have been the great pioneers? Origen, condemned as a heretic in the reign of Justinian; Erasmus, whose books are on the Index; Sir Thomas More, beheaded;

Bruno, burnt alive. Are not the Quakers, as a body, the best Christians now in the world? They are the smallest of all the sects, and they do not increase. "A popular religion is always a corrupt religion," said Cardinal Newman, the *enfant terrible* of Catholicism. No; we may have an Erasmian Reformation; I pray God we may; but we shall never have an Erasmian Church.'

Professor Raven, a Churchman no less distinguished than Dean Inge, deals with the New Reformation in his latest book, *Science, Religion and the Future*,[1] in a manner which will attract many readers among younger university men. In 'The New Reformation' (the fifth of his eight lectures arranged by the Divinity Faculty of the University of Cambridge) he opens with the words:

'The "new Reformation" which, as Huxley claimed, must necessarily follow the scientific Renaissance has not yet come.'

Dr. Raven, however, is convinced that it will come, although he is not optimistic enough to feel assured that he will live long enough to see it realized.

Dr. Raven has the great advantage, enjoyed by Professor Hort, the profoundest of the Cambridge theologians of the nineteenth century, of being both a systematically trained theologian and a systematically trained scientist. This gives him both an understanding of and a sympathy with scientific methods, claims and aspirations. Such qualifications in Christian leaders are absolutely necessary for the promotion of the new Reformation. The old Reformation was in England primarily Biblical and humanist, not scientific. Francis Bacon and his *Novum Organum* only appeared after the battle was won. But in the new Reformation, although the Christian theologian has certainly to make terms with Biblical and historical criticism, it is Science, hydra-headed, with which he must come to terms. Dr. Raven's plan lays down as an indispensable preliminary

'the reconciliation of science and religion which a new Reformation would demand and enable.'

When superficial critics condemn off-hand the leaders in Church and Science for not having achieved this reconciliation of science and religion, they do not realize the tremendous difficulties with which this task is beset and the very considerable efforts which have been made and are being made by those who recognize the absolute need of Science and the absolute need of the Christian religion for human welfare. New discoveries in physics, psychology and anthropology have lent themselves to popular perversion in the interests of scepticism and materialism. The same may be said

[1] *Science, Religion and the Future*. By Charles E. Raven, D.D., Master of Christ's College and Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge. Published by Cambridge University Press, 1943. Price 7*s*. 6*d*.

of the effects of modern research in the sphere of Biblical studies and Christian origins. For instance, the brilliant work of Schweitzer in his *Quest of the Historical Jesus* and Otto's *Das Heilige* exercised a most disastrous influence on Christian claims among the half-educated.

The great Conferences of Christian leaders and students associated with Edinburgh, Birmingham, Stockholm, Lausanne, Jerusalem and Oxford seemed to promise much but led to little. The forces of Christian conservatism, denominational sectarianism, ecclesiastical vested interests, timid compromise, insufficient realization of the achievements of modern research and their proper application to the solution of our modern ecclesiastical problems all contributed to this disappointing result. The Great War intervened, and the forces of religious reaction, particularly prominent in the movement of Karl Barth, checked the advent of the new Reformation which had seemed so promising. Dr. Raven thus describes the situation :

> 'As the breakdown of civilization in the fifth century and the hideous warfare of the sixteenth produced Augustine and Calvin, so the calamities of 1914-18 produced Dr. Karl Barth and the new Calvinism with its insistence upon the disparity of nature and grace, the futility of all human effort, and the total depravity of man's fallen state. . . .'
>
> 'Extravagance, not to say exaggerated obscurantism, is unhappily of the essence of this reaction. At a time when, as we have seen, the abler minds in Christendom were beginning to respond to the new outlook in science these "revolutionaries" reverted to the legends and superstitions of the old order or to an irrationalism which contentedly writes meaningless rhetoric and justifies it as the proper language to apply to the ineffable. The reasonable was renounced in favour of the numinous, the ethical and prophetic in favour of the apocalyptic and eschatological. "Liberal," "rational," "modernist" became terms of abuse. History was made subordinate to facts never actually observable and to theological ideas current in the early Church. Problems of date, authorship and authenticity were brushed aside not merely as insoluble but as irrelevant. There were abundant signs that Christianity was being reduced to the level of an improved Mithraism; or even that the apologetic rejected a generation before—"the Universe is illogical: Christianity is also illogical: therefore Christianity explains the Universe"—was being put forward as the latest version of Catholic orthodoxy.'

Now the Second Great War has come, full of suffering but full of sacrifice; abounding with destruction in the material world, but full of promise in the world of social, economic and political reform, and we believe not less full of hope in the spheres of religious and moral reformation. Of course reaction, obscurantism, exhaustion, hedonism, scepticism and materialism may again arise to check the new Reformation, but, as we see it, the outlook is hopeful. In any case, those who believe in the principles of the new Reformation can have no doubt as to their duty to stand for them.

336792

A Pan-Protestant Cathedral.

The *Church Times* of April 2 (p. 178) vigorously condemns Dr. Gorton, the new Bishop of Coventry, declaring that he has dropped 'a new bomb on his Cathedral' when he expressed the hope that 'after its restoration it should serve undenominational uses and not be the preserve of any particular sect.' If the Bishop is serious in this suggestion, then the *Church Times* declares that this foreshadows

> 'a revolutionary rôle for the cathedral in modern life. From being the mother church of a diocese, the pattern of liturgical worship and the centre of sacred learning and teaching, Dr. Gorton would have it become the mouthpiece of civic consciousness and interdenominational goodwill.'

What need is there for this 'either—or' antithesis? Cannot and ought not the great church of every English diocese perform all these functions and a number of others besides? It was, we believe, the ideal of the great and good Bishop Chavasse that the great House of God which he desired to have built in Liverpool should be the spiritual home of all the moral and Christian forces in that enterprising city—the centre of civic religious worship and noble civic inspiration. Moved by this ideal, men of all religious denominations in Liverpool gave generously to the projected civic cathedral—the first example of the new model. In Liverpool, this interdenominational ideal has not yet been realized, but we heartily hope that, where Liverpool has come short, Coventry may succeed.

The old St. Michael's, Coventry, possessed at least one civic Guild Chapel, that of the Hatters and Cappers with their motto *Decus et tutamen* (An ornament and a protection), the true ideal of what our hats ought to be and a symbol also of the part which religion ought to play in civic life. We can think of no movement to strengthen, extend and develop this union of the civic and religious spirit which could be more useful in modern society and more congenial to the modern mind than the Bishop of Coventry's movement. The disastrous libel so sedulously propagated in certain circles to-day that the only interest that business, either great or small, has in the Christian religion is to gag it and enslave it, can be most effectively discredited and dissipated by bringing into the closest relations in the very centre of every great British city the fearless, intelligent and sympathetic teachers of the Christian religion with the beneficent, scientific and adventurous leaders of industry and commerce. This is not less true of the part which every cathedral ought to play in bringing into closer co-operation and better understanding all the various religious denominations which co-exist in every great municipality. These denominations or groups are 'sore let and hindered' in their curiously restricted

efforts to secure reunion; but the common use of the great House of God in their midst for purposes of devotion, education, discussion and fellowship might well prove to be the most effective factor in achieving their heart's desire.

Why a Church journal which uses the word 'Catholic' to describe the Christian religion should refuse to use it of the Bishop of Coventry's cathedral policy (and should dub that policy 'Pan-Protestant') is due, we fear, to the grand word 'Catholic' being applied to an ecclesiastical party which, far from standing for that which is universal, comprehensive, large-hearted and great-minded, is fast becoming identified with what is narrow, rigid, illiberal and schismatic.

The Church of the New Order.

Dr. Kirk, Bishop of Oxford, in his recent address delivered in the Sheldonian Theatre to the Oxford Diocesan Conference (as reported in the *Oxford Mail* of May 5) dealt with 'The Church of the New Order,' which he described as follows:

> 'It was intended to include all men of goodwill who, by any extension of the term, could possibly be called "Christians." It appeared that they would not be asked to accept or subscribe to any detailed creeds. So long as they were willing to describe themselves as "followers of Christ" the full spiritual privileges of the Church would be open to them. The permanent and normal ministers of the Church would probably be persons who had received episcopal ordination or consecration, but there would be nothing exclusive about their position and it would also seem that no strong objection would be raised to the officiant at the Holy Communion being, on occasion, a layman, or even perhaps a laywoman.'

Dr. Kirk asked, 'Is this Church of the New Order a figment of my own imagination?'

> 'I do not think so,' he said. 'An impartial study of the scheme for reunion in South India suggests that in practice the United Church may for many years to come be a Church such as I have described. The same may be said of various other schemes and suggestions for reunion which have gained currency in this country and elsewhere. If the "United Services" with which we are becoming familiar are truly representative of what the English really like, then there is little doubt that the public worship of the "Church of the New Order" will not differ widely from them.'

Dr. Kirk declared, however, that he regarded the Church of the New Order as a creation to which he was in strong opposition:

> 'For anyone who believes, as I do, that the policy and teaching of the Church of England have their roots in Scripture and Apostolic tradition, whilst those of undenominationalism are, by this test, to be adjudged woefully inadequate, then the two Churches are, in vital respects, contrary to one another — if one flourishes, the other must fall into a decline. It becomes all important, therefore, to secure that children who have been

entrusted to the care of the Church of England at their baptism should not be inoculated, during their schooldays, in a type of religious teaching which is really, and has been from the moment of its origin, a veiled attack upon many of the first principles for which we stand.

Church children in Council schools are entitled to, and must receive, instruction in the Faith and practice of the Church of England. If the present regime of undenominationalism in the schools is allowed to continue unabated the result for the country will be disastrous. The "Church of the New Order," with its countless un-Scriptural characteristics, will achieve all but universal sway, and the Church of England, as we know it, will be relegated to the status of an obstinate and opinionated sect.'

We agree with Dr. Kirk's diagnosis of the religious situation in this country: we differ absolutely from the remedy which he prescribes. He stands for strict isolation of the National Church from the other Protestant denominations in our land:

'It might be argued that the two Churches could flourish side by side in amity until such time as they reached agreement on their points of difference. Some years ago it would have been possible to say that, but to-day he did not think it was.'

Dr. Kirk declared that

'The advocates of the "Church of the New Order" did not see in it something which would allow the Church of England to retain its separate individuality.'

We are convinced that Dr. Kirk's policy of ecclesiastical isolation must prove fatal to the Church of England if he and his fellow Anglo-Catholics can secure the triumph of that policy. It is a policy of stagnation which must conclude with the extinction of the Church of England or with its incorporation as a Uniat Church into the Church of Rome.

The liberal Christian policy which we have for years advocated can alone secure the revival of the English Church. The coalescence of the English Church with the various Protestant denominations in this land need cause no apprehension to those who wish well unto our Zion. By coalescence the English Church will not be bereft of the special contribution it can make to the ideal of National Church life, and that because such an advance would be a development in harmony with the true ideal and real spirit of our National Church. Of such an evolving National Church it may be truly said:

'Le plus ça change, le plus c'est la même chose.'

The New Orthodoxy and the Old in Conflict.

The *Church Times* published on March 19 a very able article entitled 'What does Dissent believe and teach?' by a layman. In it the religious beliefs and teaching of Dr. Nathaniel Micklem and other High Church Dissenters are commended; but it is realized

that they are far from representative of the great body of dissenters whose worship is emotional, who know little of the Fathers, ignore the Scholastics, and have little use for traditional dogma.

> 'At its best it sounds the heights and depths of Christian experience; but its average level is sentimental. Christ has become more important to the disciple as teacher than as Lord and God. In England, during the last hundred years, there has grown up a hymnology which exactly mirrors this tendency, with its strong ethical bias. These verse moralities have incalculable influence. The ecstasy of personal devotion to the Redeemer has died down, and has been replaced by an often Pelagian attitude to Christ as Leader and Pattern. Hymns have appeared which consist entirely of moral precepts, sometimes not even mentioning God; and children stand up and sing:
>
> "More dear to Thee than prayer and praise
> Are loyal deeds and patient ways."
>
> . . . The majority of Nonconformist ministers have been trained by teachers deeply dyed in liberalism. . . . Men now have the same experience of direct contact with God in Christ; but they are not necessarily bound by the Apostles' way of expressing it.
>
> This has yielded a very meagre and subjective doctrine of the Atonement. There is little understanding of the Church and the sacraments, and sacrificial ideas and language have had largely to be apologized for. The preacher has fallen back on a working doctrine of God the loving Father and Christ the Revealer of His love, and against this background he presents a gospel of moral endeavour. . . . Whereas of old, in their mission services, dissenting preachers pointed at the Church's ecclesiasticism, and cried that for the true meat of Christian teaching men must "go back to the Bible," it is now the dissenting writers and preachers, and the lay evangelists following them through the medium of study circles, who hurry to explain large sections of the Bible away.'

The layman critic of dissent next proceeds to cite examples of this in the teaching of well-known dissenting scholars. At the head of his list he very properly places Dr. C. J. Cadoux, Professor of Church History in Mansfield College, Oxford.

> 'Dr. C. J. Cadoux lists as "dubious" such items in the Gospel narrative as the Virgin-birth, the omniscience of Christ, His nature miracles, His consciousness of pre-existence, His claim to unique sinlessness, His claim to forgive sins in His own right, the Johannine discourses, the empty tomb and the physical ascension. Many of the statements of the creed, "put to the test of historical credibility, have failed to pass."'

To this criticism Dr. Cadoux made the following trenchant reply, published in the *Church Times* of April 2, 1943:

> 'SIR,—The article published in your issue of March 19, headed "Recent Tendencies in Nonconformity," by a Lay Correspondent, seems to call for some comment from the Nonconformist side. I cannot, of course, undertake to answer for all my brethren, but as the Lay Correspondent mentions me as a typical offender, and as I know something at least of the state of affairs in our ranks, I should like to offer an eirenic word or two by way of reply.
>
> I would plead, in the first place, that Nonconformists are perfectly right in drawing a distinction between the importance of the foundation-

realities of Christian experience and the importance of the doctrines built thereon. I know that this is a difficult distinction for Christians of a certain tradition to allow. But surely even they must see that the commitment of heart and life to God through Christ, the practice of fruitful prayer, loyal obedience to God's will so far as it is known—that these and other foundation-realities of Christianity, direct expressions of "faith," stand in a different category from, and matter more than belief in, say, the Virgin Birth, and other doctrinal conclusions reached by Christians after reflecting on the fundamental experiences. Hence, if the phrase "articles of faith" is allowable at all, as a designation of Christian doctrines, it involves a use of the word "faith" in a clearly different sense from that employed by our Lord Himself and by St. Paul.

I do not want it to be inferred from this that I regard doctrines as unimportant: what I would urge is that the only condition that matters in connexion with them is that they should be true. It is here that the word "orthodox" begs the question. Persons already satisfied with a certain selection of traditional doctrines customarily described as "orthodox" naturally like to assume, and tacitly expect others to agree, that these particular traditional beliefs are unquestionably true. But have they any right to make that assumption? Surely they ought to remember (1) that it is only truth that guarantees orthodoxy, not *vice versa*; (2) that in the past many beliefs long regarded as orthodox (*e.g.* Papal authority and the inerrancy of the Bible) have had to be given up, even by the Church of England, because they were found to be not true; and (3) that our Roman Catholic fellow-Christians differ pointedly from the most conservative Anglicans as to what precisely orthodoxy comprises. "Orthodoxy," therefore, is clearly a question-begging term; and Nonconformists would, I submit, be fully justified, until their beliefs are proved to be untrue, in declining to be labelled "unorthodox," when all that is really meant is that on this point or on that they depart from traditional doctrines.

If fear be felt lest our Nonconformist grasp of Christian truth should suffer from our refusal to accept a certain selection of traditional beliefs as necessarily true and orthodox, irrespective of any advance in Christian thought, we would refer our critics to their belief and ours in the Holy Spirit of God, who, we are assured, will lead us into all truth, who takes of the things of Christ and imparts them unto us, and who can be trusted (so long as we are sincere and diligent) to safeguard us from calamitous error. Whatever measure of eternal truth inheres in traditional beliefs will lend itself to demonstration to-day, and will not need to depend for its acceptance on tradition only.

Finally, in regard to Lay Correspondent's comparative depreciation of the Nonconformist stress on ethics as distinct from pure doctrine, Nonconformists would claim that, in our Saviour's words about those who should call Him "Lord, Lord," about the two houses built respectively on rock and sand, and about the outsider who was casting out evil spirits in His name, they possess the best warrant any Christian can have for placing the stress where they do—and this without denying the importance of truth in their doctrinal beliefs.'

The nature of the conflict between the old orthodoxy and the new orthodoxy could hardly be better or more briefly expressed.

At the Reformation in the sixteenth century the Church's doctrine and worship were arraigned at the bar of Holy Scripture. Traditional Catholicism had to withstand the criticism and correction of a Protestantism which took its stand on Chillingworth's great

axiom, 'The Bible and the Bible alone, the religion of Protestants' —a Bible plenarily inspired and infallible in its every statement. In the second Reformation in which we find ourselves to-day the situation has undergone a radical change. Both Church and Bible stand together to be cross-examined and judged at the bar of the human, rational, moral and spiritual consciousness, enlightened by the Holy Spirit, and guided by it into an ever-enlarging experience of the Truth. As a consequence it is found that neither Church nor Bible can rightly claim infallibility, but each can claim to have been and to be vehicles of Divine inspiration—an inspiration that admits of many degrees and knows no finality.

An infallible Church and an infallible Bible, like an infallible Pope, belong to the past. Divine inspiration, the operation of the Divine Spirit of Truth, Freedom and Love—a spirit supremely manifest in Jesus Christ Himself—must henceforth be followed and obeyed as our Divine Guide into the Kingdom of God and as our supreme authority in faith and practice.

THREE AUTOBIOGRAPHIES AND THEIR RELIGIOUS SIGNFICANCE.

We have just read three recently published autobiographies of living Englishmen. The three books are *Short Journey*[1] by E. L. Woodward, *A Cornish Childhood*[2] by A. L. Rowse, and *Fate has been Kind*[3] by F. W. Pethick-Lawrence. All three authors are distinguished scholars; two became Fellows of All Souls, Oxford, the third a Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. All three have had many-sided and differing experiences of life. The Christian religion has played an important part in forming the character of each. Two who were Churchmen became Anglo-Catholics; the third was, and remains, a Unitarian. The two Anglo-Catholics, although still aesthetically attracted by Catholic worship, have become dogmatic sceptics and have ceased to believe in the Christian interpretation of the Universe. The Unitarian, profoundly Christian in his ethical ideals and practice, has retained—but deepened and enlarged—his Christian philosophy of life and has become a spiritual cosmic sacramentalist.

These facts—for they are by no means isolated phenomena in the religious situation among English-speaking people of the educated classes to-day—deserve the attention of our Church authorities. One of the autobiographers, while pouring contempt on materialism, significantly adds:

> 'I should be equally false to the conviction of my whole being and to the conclusions reached over many years if I did not also say that, as far as I am concerned, and as far as most men of my generation are concerned, Christian theology is a hindrance to understanding.'[4]

[1] Faber & Faber, 10*s*. 6*d*.
[2] Jonathan Cape, 12*s*. 6*d*.
[3] Hutchinson & Co, 15*s*.
[4] Woodward, *op. cit.* p. 218.

We realize that desperate attempts at religious reaction are being made to-day. The impulse of the reactionaries would seem to be largely derived from continental sources. Their influence, though intense, is restricted almost entirely to pietist circles, and the great majority of the laity is untouched. Our religious reactionaries maintain that the remedy for languishing Traditionalism is to be found in more dogma and in a sterner insistence on its necessity for salvation. They maintain that liberal religious thinking is the cause of the Church's weakness, and that without the acceptance of all the traditional Christian dogmas it is impossible to retain Christian moral ideals, Christian character and Christian practice.

A study of these three autobiographies suggests that the reactionaries are wrong in the remedy they prescribe. Christian liberalism can alone save the situation. A flexible, adaptable, expanding Christian Faith is what is needed. Such a liberal Christian Faith will postulate Divine creativity even though the physical scientists doubt and deny it — which, as a matter of fact, they do not for the most part to-day. Such a Christian Faith will strive to discern the Divine Will realizing itself in the course of human history, even though the late H. A. L. Fisher and those who follow him find no convincing evidence for it. Such a Christian Faith will act on the conviction that the Christian ideal of life, if loyally realized in ourselves, our institutions, our social and political policies, can alone secure the best results. Where the Christian Faith is held in this simple, undogmatic and experimental form, it possesses in a modern educated and progressive community a survival value and a conquering power which are not possessed by more complicated, rigid, dogmatic forms of the Christian religion.

English Character and the Christian Religion.

A prolonged discussion on English character and the Christian religion has been proceeding in the *New Statesman* (April 3 — May 8). It was initiated by an open letter to the Editor (Mr. Kingsley Martin) from the Rev. R. A. Edwards (Rector of Dartington and co-editor of *St. Martin's Review*).

In his open letter Mr. Edwards asks why Mr. Kingsley Martin, who is an agnostic, supports Christian standards of conduct although he has abandoned Christian dogma, and he further asserts that Mr. Kingsley Martin's ethics have no secure foundation except those which Christian dogma supplies.

Mr. Kingsley Martin retorted that his standards of right are not specifically Christian, and that they can be found in Confucius, Plato and other great pre-Christian moralists. At the same time he acknowledges that Christ has made valuable contributions to ethics.

Mr. Kingsley Martin does right to maintain that ethics possess an authority independent of religion. This assertion is a commonplace for every moral philosopher, but to many of the clergy it seems to come as a profane novelty. The view of Mr. Edwards — that without a religious revelation ethics cannot be absolute but only utilitarian — can be disproved historically. For instance, if Mr. Edwards will read Cicero's *De Officiis* he will find a pre-Christian pagan philosopher discussing the claims of conduct based respectively on absolute values (*honestum* = moral right) and on what Mr. Edwards calls 'pragmatic efficiency' (*utile* = expediency) and Cicero's reasoned decision for making the *honestum* and not the *utile* the standard of conduct.

Mr. Kingsley Martin, however, in entitling his reply 'Ethics without Revelation' seems to us to be guilty of a false antithesis, no doubt inherited from Christian traditional teaching. This false antithesis arises out of the belief in two kinds of religion, Natural Religion and Revealed Religion: natural religion being the product of the exercise of man's reason, revealed religion being the direct gift of God to man, miraculously imparted.

The Psychology of Religion and Comparative Religion do not justify the traditional distinction between natural religion and revealed religion. The fundamental distinction for the modern student of religion is between higher religions and lower religions. All religions are both natural and revealed in so far as they are in the true line of religious evolution and are the product of human co-operation with the creative will of God. We can have no true religion which is not God's gift to man and is not secured by man through the use of his rational, moral and spiritual nature.

In thinking of the relation of reason to revelation, we do well to recall Bishop Butler's sayings that 'Reason is the candle of the Lord within us' and is 'the only faculty wherewith we have to judge concerning anything, even of revelation itself'; and also the dictum of John Smith, the Cambridge Platonist, 'I do not oppose rational to spiritual, for spiritual is most truly rational.'

We thank the Editor of the *New Statesman* for asserting the authority of the moral consciousness, but would beg him to receive its affirmations as a Divine revelation. When Mr. Kingsley Martin, in his reply to Mr. Edwards, asserts that

> 'there is no way in which you can persuade those who are familiar with Marx and Darwin and Frazer and Freud to accept the theology of orthodox Christianity,'

we find his statement unjustified in many cases. It is certainly true that very many young men who have become familiar with the arguments and conclusions of these writers have ceased to believe in Christianity. There are, however, others who have at least as

profound an acquaintance with the arguments and conclusions of these writers who can yet regard themselves as loyal Christians. Why is this? It is because the second group take a more profound view of the Christian religion and do not identify many of the traditional dogmas and practices of the Church with essential Christian orthodoxy. The conviction of this group is that a Christian ought not to be more orthodox than Jesus Christ, and that if a man can affirm Christ's faith in the Divine Fatherhood and that all men are potentially God's children; if he can affirm Christ's faith in Himself as possessing an unique knowledge of God's true nature and will; if he can believe in the coming Kingdom of God — Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven — and work and pray for it, he is justified in claiming to be an orthodox Christian. Furthermore, such an one is justified in becoming a practising member of the Church of England, even of its ministry.

We fail to find ourselves in complete agreement with Mr. Kingsley Martin on a further point. Although Mr. Kingsley Martin recognizes the important and necessary part played by ethics in human social welfare, he seems to find no need for religion. Yet the Science of Religion makes it clear that the religious sense or instinct or faculty, or whatever we may call it, is inherent in mankind from the most primitive period, and that this religious factor plays a very important part in social evolution: that it constitutes, indeed, 'the inner side of civilization' and can give great strength and inspiration to individual and social moralities. Indeed, we would go so far as to say that the peculiar quality of a civilization is determined by the quality of its religion. For the modern Christian student, ethics and religion are evolutionary; they must be dynamic, not static, if human welfare is to be served. The Christian doctrine of the Holy Spirit demands this conviction from the Christian.

Here we take leave to add that a scientific study of religion provides a very strong case for essential Christianity as constituting the highest product of the evolution of religion — and indeed as the only form of existing religion which can ultimately hope to become the religion of mankind. Insistence on the Christian religion as 'the religion of the Spirit'—not of the letter or of any stereotyped dogmatic system—will produce no conflict with science on the one hand, nor with the essential truth of the New Testament on the other.

The Latin Language in the Roman Church.

It is the fashion of some who are not students of Church History to declare that the Roman Church never changes: *Semper eadem* is her motto. This is but a half-truth: the other half of the

truth is that Rome is always changing. It is this combination of mutability and immutability, a mixture of primitiveness, mediaevalism and modernity, which makes Rome such an interesting subject of investigation for the historical student.

Our English Reformers aimed at Scripturalness and primitiveness, and they succeeded in no small measure. Both the doctrine and the worship of our *Book of Common Prayer* are, as a whole, more scriptural and more primitive than the doctrine and worship of the Church of Rome. Yet in the matter of worship the English-Churchman discovers on occasion with surprise that his own Church is not as primitive as the Roman Church. Some years ago, in one of the great Basilican Churches in Rome — St. Paul-without-the-Walls — the sacristan announced to us, 'His Holiness said Mass here this morning.' We expressed surprise, as we thought that Papal celebrations were restricted to the Vatican, St. Peter's and St. John Lateran. 'Not so,' said he; 'the Pope says Mass in any of the ancient Basilican Churches in Rome.' Then, taking us to the altar, he described how the Pope, when saying Mass, stood on the west side facing the congregation, using, as the sacristan expressed it, 'the Greek rite.' At that time Anglo-Catholic Churchmen were contending for the 'eastward position' against Evangelical Churchmen, who were contending for the 'north position'; but the Pope, in common with all his predecessors right back to the second century, or earlier, was using the westward position — a position so ancient that the sacristan spoke of it as 'the Greek rite.'

Here was an example of the survival of a most primitive Christian custom in the Roman Church, a reminder of the days when the Greek tongue, not the Latin, was the language of divine worship in the Roman Church — that Greek-speaking Church to whom St. Paul wrote, in Greek, his *Epistle to the Romans*. It was not until the third century that the Roman Church used the Latin tongue in divine worship.

To-day, among our English Roman Catholics, there is a movement in favour of the use of the English tongue in divine worship wherever this can be done without incurring ecclesiastical censure. In the Uniat or National Churches subject to Rome great concessions have been made in the use of national languages in divine worship. It is therefore highly probable that such concessions will be made to English Roman Catholics. The *Catholic Herald* has already expressed its sympathy with this movement. It is not likely, however, that an English Mass will be quickly conceded.

Religion is the most conservative thing in the world, and perhaps nowhere is this conservatism more evident than in the language of religion. The Jews still use Hebrew in their synagogue

services, although in the fourth century B.C., as their Targums (or Aramaic translations of the Old Testament) testify, the great body of the Jewish people had ceased to understand Hebrew. Some of the earliest cultus documents known to us, the clay tablets on which are inscribed the ritual hymns used in the great shrines of Mesopotamia nearly a thousand years before Christ, are bi-lingual —the original Sumerian tongue having an interlinear cuneiform translation inserted to enable the priests to understand the language they were using in their services.

It may be asked, 'Why this linguistic conservatism in religion?' The reply is, 'The worshippers believed that the language used in their worship was the language of the deity adored and that it would displease him to be addressed in any other language than his own.'

We venture one further question bearing on the language of worship: 'Where will our Anglo-Catholic clergy, who are engaged in "farsing" the English Communion Service with passages from the Latin Mass, find themselves if the Pope authorizes an English Mass?'

THE IMMEDIATE ISSUE OF RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

By Sir Cyril Norwood, President of St. John's College, Oxford.

MUCH has been written and published, not only in the pages of the *Modern Churchman* but in newspapers, periodicals, pamphlets and books of all types, and it is not my intention in this brief article to argue further the general case. It is possible, and even probable, that by the time when what I write here is published, an Education Bill will have been presented to the House of Commons and will be before the country. I have not read it, but I can guess at its contents, more or less: there have been a good many lights in the newspapers of late, and they have not been hidden under bushels. In brief, it will be an attempt by common agreement in a spirit of goodwill to bring to an end the dual system, and the Church of England will be asked to transfer to public control its dwindling, but still substantial, asset of some eight thousand elementary schools. The practical question is whether the Church should be a willing partner in this transaction —whether in fact it can, and should, now trust the State.

If I am right in my conjectures, the Bill will seek to give the full control and cost of maintenance of all primary schools in single-school areas to the Local Education Authority, and will

offer, if this is done, that there shall be religious instruction on an agreed syllabus for half an hour a day, that this instruction shall be given by teachers willing and qualified to teach it, and that this teaching shall be subject to inspection by His Majesty's Inspectors or other duly qualified Inspectors in the service of the Local Education Authority. The Church will be represented on the Board of Managers, and will be allowed to use the premises for its own purposes on Sundays and at reasonable times out of school hours on week-days. A conscience clause will of course operate at all stages to protect both teachers and taught. There will be school prayers, an act of corporate worship every day. But religious instruction will proceed further than this. The age of compulsory school attendance will be raised to 15, and there is, of course, a strong general agreement throughout the country that it should as soon as possible be raised to 16, with part-time continued education up to 18. Here also in the post-primary stage from 11 to 15 there will be religious instruction on a definite plan in the new secondary schools of all types; here, too, there will be daily prayers. It is probable that the requirements will not be so precise in respect of time, but religion will take its place as a full subject in the secondary school curriculum, taught by regular teachers and subject to regular inspection.

In areas in which there is more than one primary school arrangements which I have not the knowledge to specify will be made for the continuance of denominational instruction, possibly on lines analogous to those of the Scottish system, and there is not, I believe, any intention of interfering with Secondary schools of denominational foundation, which exist at present in considerable numbers.

If this statement is at all correct, it must be admitted that it represents a generous offer on the part of the State; it is, indeed, an offer to go as far as it can in building a Christian foundation to the education of all the children of the country. Of the attitude of the Churches, one can but surmise that a great deal of discussion has been taking place behind closed—and sometimes imperfectly closed—doors, and that a larger measure of agreement has been reached between the Church of England, the Roman Catholics, the Free Churches, and the Jews than would have been thought to be possible twenty years ago.

What, then, is the attitude of those who will have to carry out this programme in the class-room, whose goodwill is obviously all-important? The teachers are afraid of two dangers which they find real. The first is the subtle, and then the open, creeping in of tests for teachers; the fear, for instance, that the teacher who conscientiously objects to taking school prayers will not as a matter

of fact have a great chance of becoming a Head Teacher. The second arises from their anti-clerical bias, which, whether justified or not, exists; hence their unbending determination that inspection shall be by Inspectors of the Board or of the Local Authority. But, granted that they can be satisfied on these two issues, it seems that certainly a majority, and possibly a large majority, of the teaching profession is in favour of making religious instruction more definite and more real than it has hitherto been. They believe that they can make the whole life of the school community a reflection of the values which they seek to teach, and that in the long run this will be of greater influence than the carrying out of the formal requirements of the scheme, because it will be a life lived and not a subject taught. At the secondary and higher stages there will be less tolerance of such instruments as agreed syllabuses, and a generous measure of freedom will be asked for. I have heard one distinguished Headmistress say that she is quite prepared, and indeed anxious, to teach her Sixth Form on an agreed syllabus, but it is between herself and her Sixth Form that the syllabus will be agreed.

There remains to be considered those who are not least to be considered in the whole matter — the parents of the children concerned. Experience has shown that there is very slight opposition to religious education originating from the side of the parents, and withdrawals on conscientious grounds have been few, in secondary schools, indeed, almost negligible. They may be very loose in their own adherence to the Christian Church, its dogma, and its formularies, and they may even be living a materialist and pagan existence; but they are not satisfied with it, and their general attitude is that they would like their children to have the opportunity of learning to be better Christians than they are themselves. On the whole question they would go with the teachers, and share their views.

What, then, should Churchmen do in the face of this very large measure of agreement to which all the partners in education have come? I believe that they should regard it, first of all, with gratitude as a great victory for Christian principles, a proof that the work of the Churches has not been altogether the failure which the impatience of parsons, and the indifference of laymen, sometimes represent it to be. The quickening of the national conscience on this issue I hold to be immediately due to the war, almost universally felt to be a struggle against evil standards which will corrupt the whole of life for individual men and women: men have all along realized what they are fighting against, but they are naturally vaguer as to what they are fighting for save that it shall be something more truly Christian. And, secondly,

Churchmen should regard this as an opportunity, a setting-free of the Church for its true task, which I hold to be the preaching of the Gospel. It will rid itself of a burden which it is manifestly unable to sustain, for the transfer of elementary schools from the Church to the State has been going on apace for many years. What it has to do is to recapture the homes, and as a step towards that helping, wherever it can, to make State religious instruction a success, a foundation on which it can securely build for the furtherance of its own task of bringing Britain to Christ.

My argument is that the Church, if I am right in my forecast, is to be offered all that it can fairly demand and expect. The Archbishops and the leaders of the Free Churches asked in 1941 that the Government should do five things. First, make it possible for every school to have on its staff teachers able and willing to give instruction in religious knowledge, and supervise and lead religious exercises; secondly, provide that religious knowledge be made an optional subject in training colleges and in the examination for the teacher's certificate; thirdly, secure that every day the work of the school shall include a service of united worship; fourthly, provide that text-books or syllabuses of Christian education shall be prepared by a united and representative body for use in schools wherever acceptable; and, fifthly, provide that H.M. Inspectors shall be authorized to inspect the religious education in any schools where this is desired by the Local Education Authority or by the Managers or Governors of the school. All these demands are met and conceded, and will either be made statutory obligations or enjoined by regulations carrying out the purposes of the Act, when it is passed. Or let us look at in in another way. Sir Walter Moberly in a valuable analysis of the situation which he made in his pamphlet published last year, *The Churches and the Teachers*, pointed out that the term 'Religious Education' was being used, with resultant darkening of counsel, in five different senses. Summarized very briefly, these are (1) Scriptural knowledge, (2) Christian moral values, (3) the sense of the living God, (4) the Christian faith in the sense in which it is held in common by all the major Christian bodies and receives theological formulation in the Apostles' Creed, and (5) training in Churchmanship. The conclusion of his argument was that religious education in the first three of these senses could be secured in the schools, but not the last two. Indeed, to require these also would be in effect a demand from the side of the Church that the schools should do the Church's proper work for it. It is to be hoped, therefore, that the Church will warmly accept what the State offers, and turn with encouragement to the task which belongs to itself and to the contribution which it can make to the success of the State system.

For it is necessary to face the facts of the situation, and to realize that the teachers qualified to give religious instruction throughout the schools of the country do not exist in numbers anything approaching what may be regarded as the barest sufficiency. Surely here there exists an opportunity which the Church should be quick to seize. It is not intended that the property of the Church shall be expropriated, and by the transfer of the schools, though it may prove on its financial side a complicated process, money will become available which ought to be used for the educational work of the Church. The primary need being that of providing competent teachers of the Christian religion, surely it will be proper that the Church should make a great effort to provide more training colleges free from any seminary spirit, modern in outlook, and associated wherever possible with universities. A second, and at the moment still more essential service, will be the provision of short courses to help all those teachers who desire to take their work seriously and are concerned over their own inadequacy. We have to tide over an interim period, and this is the only way of doing it. A third direction of effort will lie in the improvement of Sunday schools, in the provision of adult education classes and groups for reading and discussion. A fourth will be the provision of suitable text-books at the secondary school stage.

It must be repeated that this is not to be thought of as a shifting of responsibility from the Church to the State, but a call to be active and zealous in the field of education in a new way. For the proposals of the Government, if they are implemented, mean that all children will at the age of 16 leave school with some knowledge of the Bible, some real understanding of Christian ethics, and some sense of God the Creator and Father of all. Of how many, or rather of how few, can this be said now? Surely the Church will be presented with an opportunity such as it never has had, an opportunity which, if it is able and wise in the use of it, may bridge the gap which to the detriment of both sides separates the Church of to-day from the educated laity, so that they now each go their own way, and at times do not speak each other's language.

THE SOCIAL OBLIGATIONS OF THE CHURCH*

By A. M. Carr-Saunders, M.A.,
Director of the London School of Economics and Political Science.

WHEN I received an invitation to attend this meeting and to read a paper on ' The Social Obligations of the Church,' my immediate inclination was to plead my complete lack of fitness for the task. I still remain convinced of my unfitness. I accepted because I remembered that I have spent the best part of my working life in teaching the social sciences, and that I should like to call myself a Christian. That being so, I ought, I reflected, to have some views upon this question.

You will understand that I must speak primarily as a sociologist. I can say nothing about the doctrinal basis of the claims of the Church to concern itself with the social order. I must choose a way of approach that is suited to my own experience, limited and specialised as that is, and I will begin by asking whether a community of Christians would develop a distinctive social order. Such a community would seek to follow a certain way of life, not merely in the matter of private devotions, but also in all contacts with other men in the ordinary business of life. A community acting in this way would certainly be led to mould the social order in such a fashion that it impeded as little as possible Christian behaviour in all communal activities. I do not mean that there is one Christian social order good for all times and places. Manifestly the social order must be adapted to changing circumstances, such as the scope of the community measured by the extent of its territory and by the size of its population, and such as the state of development of the mechanical arts. What I mean is that, given the circumstances of time and place, there would be formed in a Christian community a distinctive social order suited to those circumstances. This seems to me to be beyond dispute, and I will not labour the point.

When I look round and examine the present social order, I find that it does seriously impede in very many directions the pursuit of the Christian way of life. To many men, seeking to fulfil their duty of supporting themselves, there are open only activities the following of which involves definitely unchristian relations to other men — the making of worthless or even harmful articles, participa-

* A paper read to the Oxford Conference of the Anglican Evangelical Group Movement and republished by kind permission of the Editor of the *Bulletin*.

tion in the business of producing misleading or untruthful advertisements, for example. To me the situation is so plain that I do not propose to dwell on the point. I will merely say that in my belief a Christian community would radically change the present organization of industry and commerce.

It will be noticed that this statement involves either the view that we have not at present a Christian community in this country, or the view that the Christian community is impotent. This is a matter which I leave for later discussion. For the moment I turn to consider some questions related to the process by which social change comes about.

The social order is manifested in habits, customs, conventions and institutions; these terms are arranged in ascending order according to degree of precision of the conception and to the exactness of the supporting sanction. In modern communities, with which alone we are concerned, we may reserve the last term in the series, namely, institutions, for institutions which are defined by law and enforced by legal process. Now, a programme of social reform must be exclusively concerned with changes in institutions so defined, and it is, therefore, a matter of no small importance to discuss the part played by institutions in making the social order what it is.

Since habits, customs and conventions can be changed without changing the law, no programme of social reform seems to be needed where changes in these aspects of the social order are desired. Indeed, it is possible to urge that changes in habits customs and conventions can so affect the working of an institution as to modify it almost out of recognition. Slavery, for example, may be made almost a benign institution; at least, it is certain that the institution of slavery is a very different thing in one place or at one time as compared with its nature at another place or another time. On these lines a case can be made out for saying that the practice of the Christian way of life can transform the social order without legal changes, and, therefore, without the carrying through of a social programme. This case is not likely to carry conviction; in any event, it does not convince me; even if slavery can be made nearly unobjectionable to Christians — and that is to assume a great deal — there is no reason why an institution should be allowed to persist which can only be incorporated within a Christian scheme of life with very great difficulty. Further, it can be urged that our conventional class distinctions and our habits of acquisition and speculation, which I regard as unchristian, spring in the last resort from our legal institutions governing property and the legal structure of commercial enterprises. In this there appears to be a considerable measure of truth, and there is

thus a case for advocating changes in the institutions in question; otherwise a state of things remains which renders the pursuit of the Christian way of life almost intolerably difficult. Therefore, we are driven to admit the need for a Christian programme of reform, though we should not fall into the error of supposing that legal institutions are all-powerful in shaping the whole social order and that there is no place for the modification of habits and customs under the pressure of Christian strivings. This error is prominent to-day; I do not wish to say more than that its correction is urgent. The impression made upon the world by Christians who neglect their immediate social duties and fix their eyes upon schemes of legal change is unfortunate. It is one of the reasons why the world does not pay to Christian programmes the attention due to them.

On these lines it can be maintained that it is an obligation of the Church to present a programme of social reform. At this point it is relevant to recall that experience shows how hard it is to forecast the result of change. In the years before the last war, when I first became conscious of social problems, there was bitter controversy, which I well remember, concerning proposals to introduce social services, health and unemployment insurance, old age pensions, milk in schools, school medical treatment, and so on. It was said that the recipients would lose self-respect, incentive to work, and be, in fact, pauperized. In particular it was said that if pensions were provided, men would no longer save. These prophecies have not come true, at least in my opinion, and in any case where exact measurement is possible they have certainly not come true; for example, it can be shown that voluntary saving has increased with the granting of pensions.

Forecasting in this realm is in general a difficult art. The difficulty is increased at the moment in more ways than one. There is much to be said for the view that social change has lagged behind the needs of the time, and that large changes are, therefore, necessary. Again, owing to advances in governmental technique, the possible scale of change is great. So, while in the simpler circumstances of former days, when change was less needed and the scale of possible change more restricted, it was a matter of estimating the results of proposed changes with good hope of some approximation to truth, it is now rather a matter of guess-work than of estimation.

These difficulties face all those who are interested in the question of social reform. But we are here concerned with the question of a Christian programme of social reform, and it is appropriate at this point to deal with a matter to which I made reference earlier. I said that in my view a Christian community would radically alter the present social order and in particular the existing organisation

of industry and commerce, and that to hold this view implies as a corollary the view either that there is no Christian community in this country to-day or that it is impotent.

I would hesitate long before attempting to characterize the position in this country to-day, but Mr. T. E. Eliot's view of the situation seems to me to be not far from the truth. He says that 'we have a culture which is mainly negative, but which, so far as it is positive, is still Christian.' 'I do not think,' he goes on to say, 'that it can remain negative, because a negative culture has ceased to be efficient in a world where economic as well as spiritual forces are proving the efficiency of cultures, which, even when pagan, are positive; and I believe that the choice before us is between a new Christian culture and the acceptance of a pagan one.' Such is Mr. Eliot's diagnosis, and, if true, as I believe it to be, the task of the Church is to make effective this positive element in our culture of which it is the guardian.

Is the Church in a position to undertake this task? I need not dwell upon the difficulties which arise from disunity, and the internal problems of Church organization. Approaching the matter as a sociologist, I point to the difficulty already mentioned which faces all who would re-mould the social order, especially under present circumstances, and I have in addition to point out that the Church to-day labours under peculiar disadvantages. This is the essence of what I have to say this morning; in my view the Church has social obligations, and it is of extraordinary importance that it should fulfil them at the present time. But I believe that there are difficulties which, unless realized and overcome, will lead to an endeavour to fulfil the duty which will be ineffective.

The proper line of social action in a particular situation cannot be deduced from first principles; it is not possible merely to take thought and as a result formulate a social programme. The guidance of social change is an art, the practice of which requires a tradition of special skill based upon a habit of social observation and of social analysis and a close acquaintance with the way in which the social order responds to new influences. The Church to-day has inherited no such tradition, because it has not been actively concerned with the social order in the immediate past. I may perhaps make more clear what is in my mind if I attempt to say what would be the position if the Church were continuously active in the whole realm of social relations. The members of the Church would imbibe a habit of examining all elements of the social order with the object of discovering how far the Christian way of life was encouraged or impeded; they would be familiar with attempts to remedy defects and their results, and they would thus have inherited a certain skill in social action. There would

be a general concensus of opinion about the chief features in the social order, though there would be no unanimity, especially in regard to the most promising way of coping with new evils. The difficulties of forecasting the results of social actions would mean that in certain situations Christians would be at variance. But as experience accumulated Christian opinion on points formerly under dispute would consolidate; disagreement, however, would no doubt always manifest itself at first as new evils emerged and new problems arose.

This is not the situation within the Church to-day; there is not merely disagreement, so to speak, at the periphery, but also at the centre. No programme of professedly Christian reform commands any wide measure of consent among Christians, and that is because there is no common view about the rightness or otherwise of the main elements in the social order — the property system, for example. That in turn is because the Church has not been interested in these matters of late. There is a danger that the Church, becoming suddenly aware of the gravity of the social situation, may attempt to take a step for which it is not fitted, and formulate prematurely a social programme; indeed, the Malvern Conference might be regarded as an attempt to do so. Such an attempt would not be effective because almost certainly Church opinion would not consolidate sufficiently behind any one programme; even if it did, that programme could hardly be, in fact, specifically Christian, because there is inadequate Christian social experience to make it so.

What, then, can the Church do? I would suggest that the first effort should be directed towards the observation of the existing social order and of present social trends. There is no small amount of good observation to-day; but people see what they set out to observe, and there are few observers who are interested in the Christian way of life and, therefore, in watching those aspects of the present mode of living which are important to Christians. Early Christian literature is full of observations so illuminating that it amounts almost to revelation; of that sort of observation there is abundant need to-day.

Next is required an attempt to ascertain where and how social life departs from Christian standards; this involves analysis and evaluation. Once again this is lacking, but the gap can only be filled if observation precedes. The use of the word 'analysis' tempts me into a digression. I live among economists, though not one myself. They are much misunderstood people. Part of their work is concerned with observation of the kind to which I have already referred; this scientific observation, limited as it is, merits more attention than it gets. Another side of their work is

related to analysis. This analysis is largely scientific, in semi-mathematical form. However much economists may disagree in certain matters, there is a very large field of economic analysis which is on all hands accepted as accurate. The Douglas Credit theory, if (and that is not easy) it can be stated in intelligible propositions, is found on analysis to be logically fallacious; about that there is no disagreement whatever among economists. Concerning the analysis of the monetary mechanism, the working of which is connected with the trade cycle, there is also a large measure of agreement. Now, Christians, because they are such, should be even more aware than other men of the results of intellectual analysis of this kind. They will neglect existing work at their peril; but they should seek to widen purely scientific observation, and to amplify purely scientific analysis. I mention this because I seem to detect a certain tendency to put this work aside; the report of the Malvern Conference, for example, seems to me to show inadequate awareness of what has been done. Let me make clear that I only say that Christians, faced by social problems, should no more put aside the work of economists than should Christians faced with the problem of human origins put aside the work of biologists, geologists, and archaeologists.

Returning to the main thread of the discussion, I would next suggest that the duty of the Church is continuously to promote the consolidation of opinion within its own ranks about the social order. As observation accumulates and as analysis is made, the time arrives when a consensus of opinion is possible among Christians concerning aspects of the social order and of its defects. We lack that consensus of opinion altogether now because the facts and their meaning are obscure; as Christian experience of facts grows, there is less excuse for variance. It is the positive duty of the Church, as soon as evidence is available, to press the view that a refusal to face the facts and to understand their implications is largely the reason for failure to agree. In the measure that the Church succeeds in consolidating Christian opinions, Christian action becomes possible.

We all wish to see that day, but do not let us in our haste omit the indispensable preparatory work. I cannot but feel that the unsatisfactory impression made upon me by the proceedings of the Malvern Conference is the consequence of undue haste. I pass most of my time among young people studying the social sciences, and for the most part acutely aware of evils in the social order and anxious to abolish them. To these young people recent Church pronouncements in social reform make no appeal. That is not because they are out of sympathy with the general nature of the remedies proposed; quite the contrary, for the remedies are familiar enough and are apparently selected from the stock-in-

trade of progressive parties. It is not because they expect novel remedies; there is already a plethora of prescriptions. It is because they do not see that what is proposed is necessary if the Christian way of life is to predominate. I do not mean that they are consciously attracted by the Christian life; far from it, for they would mostly reject anything labelled Christian. But I profoundly believe they yearn after what is in truth the Christian way of living. As I see the situation, these young students want a society which is positive, whereas, using Mr. Eliot's terminology, our society is almost neutral. They will only welcome a positive pagan society if nothing else offers. If a positive Christian society is to offer itself, it must be through a social programme which is more than a series of concrete suggestions. It must be made clear that those making these suggestions have in mind the realization of a certain way of life, namely, the Christian, that to lead this life obstacles must be removed and new situations created. This must be shown with that richness and fullness of exposition which is possible only when there is a richness and fullness of experience and resulting wisdom upon which to draw. The ability to make that exposition is lacking in the Church to-day. That is the tragedy of the present situation, and all the Church can do is earnestly to prepare itself for the task which by reason of past neglect it cannot now perform. Premature action would be futile and perhaps fatal. It would be futile because it would not draw support. It might be fatal because it would cause antagonism. For if the Church acts without having behind it the authority which conviction, founded upon experience, alone can give, it will appear merely to be competing for public favour by promoting a popular — even a vote-catching — programme. If it appears in this guise, it will rightly forfeit, or fail to regain, the respect of the public.

I have been speaking of the duty of the Church, when fully prepared, to formulate a social programme, and so far I have indicated that such a programme must aim at removing the obstacles to the leading of a Christian life. It must, however, do more; it must be constructive. It is notoriously more easy to be critical than constructive, and I have little to offer. Speaking, however, as a sociologist, I believe that I can discern certain elements which are necessary in a social order that is to be Christian. A Christian has a duty to his neighbour, but to exercise this duty he must have neighbours. We may say that a Christian society must be animated by the neighbour principle; Nazi society by the fuhrer principle; while Liberal society has exaggerated the rôle of the individual as an individual. Liberal society takes this as a starting-point, but lacks an aim; Liberalism, as Mr. Eliot has said, is a movement defined not so much by its end as by its point of departure. Thus it frees energy which is destructive of

much and, incidentally, of neighbourhood relations. In the chaos so produced men may grasp at the fuhrer principle to save them. The Church should advocate the rebuilding of social mechanisms so that the neighbourhood principle can have full play.

The neighbourhood principle implies notably that men have in general responsibilities as well as claims on others, but also that neighbourhood in the geographical sense must be the fundamental basis of social groupings in the future. The true neighbour is the man who lives near by, not the man who follows the same vocation; it is noteworthy that the Fascist regimes tend to be built upon vocational and party groups, and not on geographical groups. In this country we have allowed attachment to the neighbourhood to become very weak; the local community, whether in town or country, has almost passed away, and yet it is in the local community alone that the elements of Christian living can be learnt and practised. Those living side by side should learn together, do things together and enjoy things together. This may sound vague and it may seem at first that no concrete plans can be built upon such a foundation. But this is not so; learning together means an end to the class cleavage in education, for example, and the implications of doing and enjoying things together are equally revolutionary.

I cannot attempt to follow out these implications. I am concerned only to point out that there is some danger of concentrating overmuch on the removal of obstacles and that it is urgent for the Church to think out constructive proposals. In so doing I hope it will avoid the common error of beginning at the wrong end and of formulating schemes into which man is somehow to be fitted. The Christian must think of man and his duty to his immediate neighbour; let opportunities for this duty to be practised be given, and the larger problems can then be seen in their proper perspective and with some hope of solving them, so that the Christian way of living will permeate the whole society.

This leads me to my final point. Christian thinking is or should be concrete in social matters; it can realize true human needs because it bases itself on the fact of human personality. So much current social thinking is half abstract, placing men in categories and classes and making play with supposed antagonisms, clashes and conflicts between these abstractions. I see some tendency to adopt the phraseology of this abstract approach in certain recent Christian pronouncements, and I hope that this will not be the form that the advice of the Church will assume. If the teaching of the Church is concrete, there will be a freshness about it in a world already somewhat tired by the mere abstract type of programme, and if it is so I believe that the public will listen.

SEARCHLIGHTS ON OUR SUBMERGED TENTH

By the Rev. Charles Jenkinson, M.A., LL.B., Vicar of Belle Isle, Leeds; formerly Chairman of the Leeds Corporation Housing Committee.

AMONGST the shocks received in this country during the first year of the present war none were greater than those suffered by many people in our 'reception' areas. During the first three days of September, 1939, under the official scheme one and a quarter million people left the areas zoned for evacuation in our towns, amongst them 166,000 mothers accompanied by 260,000 children, 735,000 unaccompanied children, and 12,000 expectant mothers. Billeting had its difficulties, but in general the evacuees were received with kindness, in many cases with great generosity. But immediately billeting was completed cries of astonishment, dismay and indignation arose from the whole of the reception areas, directed against sections of the evacuees from every one of the towns affected. The country at large was being acquainted at first hand with the manner of life of certain of our town dwellers, and the experience was unpleasant. In varying degrees, many young mothers were declared to be dirty, verminous, idle, ignorant of housecraft, lacking in control over their children, sometimes drunken, and so forth. Numbers of children were ill-clad and ill-shod, many were dirty, verminous, bed-wetters and worse, clearly unused to sleeping in normal beds, defiant of retiring to sleep at reasonable hours, suffering from skin diseases, refusers of normal wholesome foods, and (less frequently) destructive, liars, pilferers. Visits to these types of children by their relatives at week-ends did little to create a better impression: the children were obviously 'chips of the old blocks.'

The tense situations created were relieved to a very considerable degree by the early return to the towns of a large percentage of those who were the subjects of the most bitter complaints, and there has been a progressive improvement since. But the questions remained, 'How is it that the state of affairs revealed exists, what is its extent, and what are the possible remedies?' The National Federation of Women's Institutes pressed these questions, and as a consequence the Hygiene Committee of the Women's Group on Public Welfare took them up and for nearly three years has devoted itself to answering them. Taking the complaints one by one, this able and well-informed committee of professional women has examined the evidence for the complaints, interviewed a number of experienced witnesses and authorities, related the complaints to conditions existing in parts of our towns, collected and collated

scattered reports and statistics of all kinds, and finally come to certain conclusions, general and detailed. Their report is now published, *Our Towns: A Close-up*,[1] and is a social document of the first importance. Nowhere else does there exist such a nation-wide, frankly expressed and constructive examination of the squalid sides of our town life.

The general finding is that the complaints were justified, that they reflect conditions existing in our towns, that — while the grounds of complaint were not confined to it, especially in regard to the toleration of head lice, deficiencies in diet, and 'wrong spending' — the percentage of our population to whom the overwhelming mass of criticism could apply is approximately ten per cent., and that the remedies are to be sought not in any one isolated field of action, but in an inter-related and urgent campaign against poverty and in the fields of housing, education and public health; and, like Charles Booth in his monumental survey of conditions in London, they conclude that 'side by side with an unremitting campaign for better material conditions, much effort should be made to rouse and strengthen the human will, both subconscious and conscious, and enlist it in co-operative effort for decent living.'

> 'Town life, with its fine and civilized flower, must be made to root in wholesome earth and not in fetid slime. . . . The interrelation of factors responsible for the dark side of our town life has perhaps not yet been sufficiently stressed. Poverty is a root cause. Pneumonia, diphtheria, tuberculosis, measles and whooping cough are the diseases of poverty which ravage child life in the overcrowded slum. Poverty leads to bad housing, without the space, water supply, food storage, cooking facilities and private sanitation essential to good home-making. Ill-found accommodation encourages bad feeding. Slum conditions — noisy streets, crowded beds, the irritation of bugs, lice and skin diseases — murder sleep. Everything that militates against healthy living encourages skin diseases, which are often closely associated with vermin. Bad feeding, inadequate sleep, insufficient air and lack of healthy exercise and recreation affect mind as well as body and aggravate the serious and growing problem of the dull child, already estimated by the Board of Education to number 15 per cent. of the eight-year-olds in elementary schools. According to the report of the Mental Deficiency Committee, dull children grow up to produce most of the problem families of the next generation, including many of the feeble-minded. Their dullness leads to bad spending and household management, undeveloped character and lack of parental control. Juvenile delinquents are closely associated with poor parental control, and also with dullness and backwardness: they bulk large amongst the unemployables and are often dangerously suggestible. Overcrowding degrades family life and warps character, again breeding delinquency through unhappiness and emotional frustration. It may produce a low social standard and coarse habits. Children who are dirty, undisciplined, unhealthy and ill-fed have no standards of well-being, and later accept these conditions in their own offspring. Not only so, but they bring to parenthood enfeebled bodies and indifferent nerves. . . .
>
> More and more it is borne in upon us that the educational services get hold of the child too late. . . . The younger the child, the more

[1] Published by the Oxford University Press, 1943; 143 + xx pages; 5*s*.

likely it is to be living in poverty: the percentage so living is higher amongst the "under fives" than in any other group of the population, higher still amongst the "under fours," and so on. Poverty spells overcrowding with all its evils. The five-year-old enters school suffering from all the complaints which the school doctors and nurses spend their time in combating during his school life. The "under fives" have been found lousier than any other group: evacuation shows that the children of five were already set in bad habits of every kind: and the psychiatrist would not fail to look in the first five years for the roots of delinquency — criminal statistics show that a child may be a thief at seven or eight years of age.

An onslaught must be made on poverty by means of family allowances and minimum wages, and the children with unsatisfactory homes must be helped by letting them live day by day in a different environment: they must have nursery schools from the age of two years. . . . We cannot afford not to have the nursery school: it seems to be the only agency capable of cutting the slum mind off at the root and building the whole child while yet there is time. . . .'

The Committee head their last chapter, from which this quotation has been taken, 'The Future Hope,' and if the correlated programme sketched throughout the Report is implemented, the word 'hope' is surely justified. From various national reports, and occasionally from special local surveys following the beginnings of modern municipal government, we know well what were the conditions of town life and manners in this country a century ago. As Mr. J. L. Hammond has written (in the admirable volume *A Century of Municipal Progress, 1835-1935*, published, significantly, under the auspices of the National Association of Local Government Officers),

'At the time of the passing of the Municipal Corporations Act the English towns were sunk in a condition of barbarism that would have put a citizen of the Roman Empire to the blush. If we compare the state of the English towns in 1835 with their state in 1935, we might well conclude that the creation of our modern system of local government is the greatest British achievement of the last hundred years.'

The worst conditions we face to-day would have seemed to the reformers of the 1840's and 50's merely the dregs of those which then faced them, and few, if any, of them would have been prepared to prophesy that from the masses they were concerned with would rise the 'middle classes' of to-day, now comprising 30 per cent. of our whole population and in 1935 receiving in *salaries* over 25 per cent. of the total national income.

The vast social improvement we can record has moreover been effected in the face of a factor not to be disregarded in our estimates or the formulation of policy — the reception into our body politic of large numbers of immigrants from the Continent, Poland in particular, and from Ireland: mostly poor, generally not of a high standard of material living, and almost invariably swelling our slum and overcrowded populations. Since the Aliens Act of 1905 the Continental flood has greatly diminished, but there is still

a considerable inflow from Eire. Few people with an acquaintance with slum conditions in certain of our towns would question the fact that this influx is a considerable factor in our 'submerged tenth' being as large a percentage as it is. *I do not notice any mention of this factor in the Report, though its weight is clearly discernible in the various references to conditions in Liverpool, and would perhaps have been still more discernible in the Glasgow area had the survey included Scotland.*

But if in face of all the facts we can yet be hopeful, we can certainly not be complacent. To raise the 'submerged tenth,' and help it to raise itself, by every possible means, is a task of the utmost urgency, since there is little doubt that the whole of the net increase in our population to-day comes from this source. No *exact* national statistics exist to prove this, and the compilation of such statistics would be a vast task. Some figures I can quote for Leeds, specially prepared for use at slum clearance enquiries during 1934-36, will not, however, be unrepresentative of the country as a whole. In all cases the birth, death and infant mortality rates are an average of the preceding ten years.

The birth-rate for the whole of Leeds was 15·9 per thousand of the population; the death-rate 13·5 per thousand.

The infant mortality rate (included of course in the general death-rate above given), *i.e.* the number of children per thousand live births who died before reaching the age of twelve months, was 86 per thousand births for the whole of the City.

The wealthier and middle class wards of the City, with stabilized populations, show a death-rate higher, in varying degrees, than the birth-rate.

A selected and representative 'good artisan class' area, chosen for its normality for the class, showed: Birth-rate 9·2 per thousand of the population; death-rate 9·2 per thousand; infant mortality rate 74 per thousand births.

The first eleven slum clearance areas dealt with comprised 5,509 houses of the oldest back-to-back type, standing at an average density of 67 to the acre, with a population of 19,165 (averaging 230 persons per acre). For these areas the averaged rates were: Birth-rate 29·3 per thousand of the population; death-rate 20·3 per thousand; infant mortality rate 132 per thousand births.

The death-rate for the whole was also analysed to show the causes of death under ten headings, with highly illuminating comparative results.

The terrific opposition put up at the official enquiries to the granting of the Slum Clearance Orders collapsed after the tenth enquiry, and to save the enormous amount of labour involved in the compilation of such statistics they were discontinued after the eleventh area. But the general conditions in the slum areas subsequently dealt with up to the outbreak of war varied but little and the figures would have been much the same. Altogether, 14,500 houses, with an average density of 68 per acre and a population of 45,000, averaging 220 persons per acre, were condemned and demolished during the six years ended by the outbreak of war.

The perusal of these figures, in their magnitude, is sufficient to show the general position: had the figures for the slum areas been further sub-divided on a 'standard of living' basis, they would

have been still more striking. As, with our present national birth- and death-rates, the population is expected to become stationary somewhere between 1951-61, and thereafter to begin to decline, the growing relative importance of the only section showing a net excess of births over deaths is obvious.

In attempting to remedy the evils disclosed in the Report, we shall no doubt find that we are faced with a certain intractable core amongst the adults, but given a sound rehousing policy, with due attention to the amenities of estates and proper management, I do not believe this core will prove to be very large. Probably no city has rehoused on its municipal estates a larger percentage of its slum clearance population than Leeds—it is not difficult to make a brave show in clearance, but in fact merely to disperse a high percentage of a slum population into adjacent poorly housed neighbourhoods. Leeds has 84·5 per cent. of its slum clearance families on its municipal estates, and keeps them there. The percentage of those families classed 'unsatisfactory' by the Housing Department is now under 5 per cent., and from many of these homes, often deplorable to the eye, time and time again one sees young people, especially about the age 16-17, clearly emancipating themselves from their home environment as a consequence of wider contacts and influences. Despite the many defects of the 'patchwork' system, or rather lack of system, which has characterized so much of our reform, substantial progress can be registered. It would be far greater if a comprehensive policy was in operation.

A critical note in the Report, in favour of large units of local government, is timely; in my opinion, a reorganization which united town and country in 'all purpose' authorities would prove the most satisfactory and lead to a more uniform advance than has been made in the recent past. It must, I think, also be recognized frankly that, with many outstanding exceptions, solid knowledge and enthusiasm is now often found more richly amongst municipal officials than amongst the bulk of aldermen and councillors.

There are two questions of outstanding importance in post-war housing policy which it is to be hoped will be determined in the light of the facts emphasized in this Report.

The first is the need to get away from the creation of 'slum clearance and overcrowding' estates, and to pursue what one may term a balanced rehousing policy. The utmost credit is due to Lord Kennet (then Sir Hilton Young) for his galvanizing into life, in 1933, the Slum Clearance Act of 1930, which then looked as if it would become almost inoperative through the inaction of local authorities. He was also responsible for the subsequent Relief of Overcrowding Act. But for this advance a heavy price was paid—for all practical purposes municipalities were prohibited from erecting dwellings for any save slum clearance and over-

crowded families, and consequently had to begin to create estates which such families would wholly or predominantly inhabit, and in which they would be almost segregated from the more normal sections of the population.

Now slum areas are not defined in terms of their inhabitants considered according to their habits of life, but in terms of property considered according to its nature and condition, and all the inhabitants of such areas are not necessarily or by any means all 'submerged.' But the more prosperous and better-standard families naturally tend to get away from such areas as soon as they can: and the erection of 4,000,000 new dwellings in this country between 1920 and 1939 has left no uncertain marks on our slum districts. One such mark is the closed chapels and semi-derelict churches now such a common feature of them — those who supported them have left the districts. And when such reduced populations are transferred as a body to form, practically, the sole initial population of new estates, those estates, inevitably, are marked by too low a general standard of intelligence, lack of capacity for leadership, and all the other general characteristics of slum areas. The consequence is a far slower general improvement than would be the case if the estate populations were well mixed, with the rehoused slum clearance and overcrowded families forming not the vast majority but a minority of the total. The enormous demand for new houses that will exist after the war makes such a policy easy of fulfilment.

The second question relates to the proper provision of houses for the thousands of young married couples who to-day have neither house nor home. This problem will grow in gravity the longer the war lasts, and from every point of view it is imperative that these young people should be provided with modern houses and given a priority only next to the blitzed-out families. Nothing is more calculated to foster family ill-feeling, domestic unhappiness and the creation of slatternliness than for young couples to have to live with relatives, or in rooms entirely unfitted for family life. They need homes of their own in houses at rents which they can afford: in this latter connection, the direct relationship between rental or mortgage payments and the birth-rate, amongst the best of such young couples, should be noted and policy framed accordingly.

There is also a third question, of much greater difficulty, but which to my mind is also of first importance: the question of the direction in which we should plan the location of our future housing. It is well recognized that, as things are, it will be impossible in many of our large towns to rehouse the present popution in accordance with modern standards except by resort to block flats on a large scale. That a certain percentage of families prefer block flats to cottages is clear, as is the fact that in some situations

the public demand for housing in given central localities cannot be met in any other way. I have myself the largest measure of personal responsibility for the general planning and erection of the biggest block of flats for poor people yet erected in this country—Quarry Hill Flats, Leeds.[2]

But all investigations show that something like 90 per cent. of our people with families prefer cottages, and I view with considerable apprehension proposals to erect block flats in towns in thousands and practically to force people into them: as, *e.g.* in the East End of London, where it is reported the London County Council is thinking of rebuilding the whole district with nothing but block flats. A revision of our housing law relating to density, to allow the erection of terrace houses of stated dimensions and amenities at, say, twenty to the acre (a revision I favour), would go some way to help avoiding this wholesale resort to block flats: but it has to be recognized that in some places nothing can avoid such a resort except a deliberate reduction, by removal, of a considerable percentage of the population of our largest towns. The Report of the Barlow Committee on the location of industry, presented to the Government in January, 1940, recommended the decentralization, dispersal and redevelopment of industry. The implementation of this policy, with the creation of satellite and new well-planned towns, will alone solve our housing dilemma, and also do something to achieve the desirable end of bringing at least some of our town dwellers a little nearer to the countryside.[3]

[2] Quarry Hill Flats, in the centre of Leeds, comprise 938 flats of various sizes from two rooms to six rooms, and cover 26 acres. There are no common balconies, but each flat has its private recessed balcony, and is served by automatic electric passenger lift, there being 88 lifts in the block. The central laundry, community centre, shopping centre, British restaurant, nursery school, stores for prams, cycles and barrows, equipped children's playgrounds, bowling greens and tennis courts are all within the flats' curtilage. They are the first and still the only dwellings in this country to have installed the Garchey system of refuse disposal by water carriage and suction. The highest rent payable by any tenant, that for a six-roomed flat, is 18*s.* 5*d.* per week, inclusive of rates, water, standard charge to reduce electricity to ½*d.* per unit, and use of laundry. A tenant in receipt of the maximum relief under the differential rent relief scheme pays for the same sized flat 9*s.* 1*d.* per week, inclusive as before.

[3] As these pages pass through the press, the Leeds City Council accepts and publishes the exhaustive post-war housing programme prepared by its Director of Housing and the Housing Committee. It provides for the completion of the pre-war slum clearance programme, involving the demolition of the remaining 16,000 houses covered by that programme but not yet condemned owing to the war, and adds the demolition of a further 28,000 houses of the next lowest grade. To rehouse the families concerned, and to provide for newly married couples and the relief of overcrowding, will require 53,000 new dwellings. Allowing for all advisable block flat and terrace house development, and taking into account all available land within the green belt that must surround the present or already planned built-up area, something like a further six square miles of land will be required for new housing and the necessary attached services. Satellite development is clearly necessitated.

THE ARMY CHAPLAIN

By Canon T. Guy Rogers, M.C., B.D., Chaplain to the King.

THE Church is proud of the record of its chaplains in the present war. Testimonies on the wireless, the considered judgment of Commanding Officers and revealing letters from men serving in the ranks leave no doubt of the general appreciation of chaplains' services. Some preliminary mistakes were made in the first rush of volunteering, as was natural, but the careful system of selection quickly introduced has achieved admirable results. It is now the privilege of Diocesan Bishops to select the most suitable men in their dioceses for recommendation to the Chaplain General for emergency commissions, and a similar system is applied to candidates from other denominations. Chaplains may be described as having been hand-picked, and it is much to be hoped that, though the demand for chaplains is now almost overwhelming, the present system of selection may not be allowed to break down. Quality must not be sacrificed to quantity. More damage can be done through the presence of a bad chaplain than the absence of a good one.

A useful little book has just been published, called *The Army Chaplain*,[1] written by the Rev. P. Middleton Brumwell, C.B.S., M.C., K.H.C., which gives an account of the developments and organization of the Royal Army Chaplains Department, with a brief description of the duties of chaplains in peace time and on active service and their vital place in the Army. It is interesting to note that chaplains appear on the pay-roll of the armies of Edward I in two classes. There was the *Capellanus magnifique*, who received the princely sum of one shilling a day, and the *Capellanus vulgaris*, who received sixpence a day for performing their duties. Three grades of chaplains, attached respectively to the King, the barons and the Welsh (!), appear in the army that fought at Crecy under Edward III. We can trace the presence of army chaplains through the reigns of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. They play an important part, as might be expected, in the armies of Oliver Cromwell. But the modern history of the Department begins with 1796, when the first Chaplain General, the Rev. John Gamble, began his work. It must have been no easy task for, apparently, his first duty was to recall 340 chaplains who were 'on leave,' having in that age of sinecures and pluralities calmly departed, leaving their duties, such as they were, to their deputies!

The present needs of our ever-expanding army are infinitely

[1] *The Army Chaplain*, by the Rev. P. Middleton Brumwell, C.B.S., M.C., K.H.C. (A. & C. Black, 1943; 3*s*.)

better met than in the last war. It seems almost unbelievable, looking back, that although many chaplains went out with the British Expeditionary Force to France in 1914, none of them was provided for in the War Establishment except one, who was called the Principal Chaplain. The rest were dependent upon the arrangements made for them by the units to which they were temporarily attached, and often found themselves inconveniently placed or even in some cases unwanted. Now there is a fixed ratio of one chaplain to every 1,250 men serving in an expeditionary force, and there is always a Deputy Chaplain-General serving at Headquarters, assisted by his own staff chaplains. Each division has its own senior chaplain with some fifteen assistant chaplains. 'War Establishment' also recognizes the need of providing chaplains for lines of communication, bases, general hospitals, casualty clearing stations, hospital ships, and to these there must be added now tank units, airborne divisions and parachute brigades. The reference to airborne divisions draws out from Mr. Brumwell a description of the kind of life which an airborne padré lives with his men, which is perhaps the most interesting paragraph in his book:

> 'When this branch of the army was formed the question arose of the chaplain taking his "jumps" as all others in parachute brigades. It was decided that chaplains should share the training common to all officers and men. This includes the preliminary and strenuous activities of physical training to fit men for such work, and is followed by instruction in parachute exercise and finally the "jumps" from aeroplane by parachute. After eight successful "jumps" the chaplain, as others, is permitted to wear his "wings" on his shoulder. It has proved a great success and adds immensely to the influence of these chaplains with the airborne divisions. They share their dangers and will be with their men in actual practice wheresoever the campaign shall take them. The training is not confined to the chaplains of one denomination, but to the chaplains of all denominations attached to those brigades. Other chaplains wear glider badges on the sleeve to denote that they have done the prescribed training in gliders.'

With the continual departure of many chaplains overseas and with the withdrawal of others to such highly specialized work, it is evident that the needs of the vast army in training and on service at home must be provided for by some special and additional arrangements. This problem has been partly solved by recruiting a number of older men as chaplains (up to the age of 57) for home service, and still more by calling in the aid of local clergy and ministers to care for the spiritual needs of troops stationed in their own areas. There are more than three thousand of the 'officiating' chapains, as they are called.

> 'They serve everywhere — in large units where there is no chaplain, or with small numbers of men scattered over the country on gun sites and searchlight positions, in hospitals and fixed garrisons, and although they

> are all entitled to a small payment for such work, based on the numbers of their denomination in the station or camp and not on the attendance at the services, yet many of them refrain from making the application for this payment and prefer to do it for the sake of the work itself and consider it to be their part of national service.'

It is interesting to note, too, how provision is being made for the thousands of women now enrolled in the Auxiliary Territorial Service (A.T.S.) who are living in large camps scattered all over the country, and who are as much part of the Army as the men called up in the ordinary way. Not only are specially selected chaplains sent to these camps, but there is also in operation a scheme, to which there was no parallel in the last war, by which specially qualified women are sent to work as lay workers under the direction of the Army Chaplains. This striking innovation has come about through the work of a committee, appointed by Lord Lang when Archbishop of Canterbury, with representatives serving on it from all the Churches. This Churches' Committee has nominated twelve women (now to be increased to twenty-four), who work at the various stations to which they are appointed. Some of these women, as I know, have inconveniences and difficulties to contend with — fitting into a new scheme not formally on 'War Establishment' — but their presence in the camps is of inestimable value to girls needing advice and help. They are largely dependent on the Spirit of God and their own personality for what they make of their job, but the fact that their number is to be doubled indicates the spiritual success already achieved by this venture.

So far this little book is excellent, and as an account of a department of Army organization it is concise, clear and lucid. It would, perhaps, have been better to maintain the departmental style to the end, describing simply how the department works and leaving it at that. The book would then have been judged as a useful contribution from a distinguished 'regular' chaplain — in other words, a semi-official handbook. Moved, however, with the best intentions, Mr. Brumwell proceeds to add a long chapter on the help which the Army Chaplain can give in maintaining 'morale' in the Army. This is dealt with at rather disproportionate length to the size of the book and leaves the impression — unintentional, no doubt — that this is the most important part of the moral and spiritual work of the Army Chaplain. Perhaps the author may put the matter right in a sequel to be added on such a subject as 'the spiritual work of the Army Chaplain.' At the present moment the subject is truncated and the treatment of it ends before it has well begun.

A wise and experienced parish priest, who was with the Expeditionary Force in France and took part in the evacuation of Dunkirk, writing to me appreciatively of the first part of the book,

adds the following comment:

> 'But if the chaplain is looking for help and advice in the exercise of his priestly and pastoral office, he will find the book unsatisfying. The duties of chaplains occupies only two pages, though a further ten pages is devoted to "other aspects of the work," which are described in the barest outline. It is true that Mr. Brumwell devotes the last chapter (some 16 pages) to the important subject of "morale" and the part which is played by the Army Chaplain in maintaining morale. This word is common in the parlance of Army Commanders and officers commanding lower formations, but it is questionable whether they mean by it the same as the Christian minister. . . . Chaplains would have wished to find more help for the spiritual side of their work, and it is regretted that the writer, with his long and varied experience in the service, did not draw on it to give counsel to the young and war-time chaplain. There is no reference to Confirmation or to the preparation for Churchmanship. Nothing is written about the place of the "Padré's Hour" in training and personal interviews. . . . Having regard to the fact that, as in the last war so in this, the army is very much an army of "civilians in uniform," and the chaplains in large measure drawn from the ranks of the parochial clergy and ministers, it is regretted that in the book the ministry of the chaplain is not better represented as the ministry of the Church to her sons and daughters in much the same way as it is exercised in civilian life. The chaplain should be no less concerned with persons and friendship than the parish priest or pastor, and while files, forms, correspondence and procedure are important, they should only be so to enable the chaplain the better to discharge his primary office of winning men and women into the discipleship of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the worship of God in spirit and in truth.'

I feel sure that the explanation of the somewhtat unsatisfactory end of Mr. Brumwell's book is that the chapter on 'Morale' is an after-thought and that it was not his original intention to write more than a departmental handbook. We may hope that either from him or from some other distinguished chaplain in due course may come an adequate statement of the chaplain's work in relation to the Church, the individual and the Kingdom of God. It will prove an invaluable sequel to this otherwise useful little book.

Perhaps as an old padré of the last war I may be allowed to add some observations of my own on the work of the chaplain both in the last war and in this. To-day the chaplain has some obvious advantages which we had not. In the first place, he is more carefully chosen. Bishop Taylor Smith, the Chaplain General in 1914, set himself an almost superhuman task in keeping the selection so largely in his own hands. He had many gifts, and his clear recognition of the function of the chaplain as a pastor of souls was a great asset to our work. But his judgment of men was often defective, and his own personality was hampered rather than helped by the medium through which it had to express itself. The creation in this war of a depot, to which chaplains on appointment are sent for some weeks for training, is a great improvement on the haphazard methods by which we learnt our job. I hear very good

reports of the depot—situated until recently at Chester—through which more than a thousand chaplains have passed. The training both on the technical and pastoral side seems to have been well thought out, though there may be some criticism as to details. I should certainly have saved myself from making many amusing mistakes, and barking up many wrong trees, had I had such an experience before going to France.

Again, the recognition of distinction between older and younger chaplains, and the wise policy of employing each according to a pre-arranged plan, is an improvement on the hasty adaptations of the last war; and the bringing in of trained women to assist in pastoral supervision opens up co-operative possibilities completely impracticable in our day.

The uncertainties, too, which existed as regards whether the chaplain belonged to the front line or more properly to 'the baggage' seem to have been decisively solved in favour of the former, as witness the paragraph I have quoted about chaplains attached to airborne troops. I was, fortunately, attached to a famous division which expected its chaplains to share its dangers. It was a marked sign of disfavour if anyone was left with the baggage. But in some other divisions traditions were in the making and chaplains were uncertain about their 'battle stations.' All this would appear to be changed, though no doubt the personal quotient still counts as to where the padré is to be billeted and what he is allowed to do when action is imminent. Certainly the arrangements by which the padré is now expected to interview new drafts, and the encouragement given to an official recognition of the Padré's Hour when moral and religious instruction is given, indicates a considerable advance both in perspective and opportunity.

Though so much has changed for the better in the padré's equipment and the scope of his work, his spiritual problems remain much the same. I notice in the letters that reach me the same difference in outlook between the 'regular chaplain' whose life-work lies with the Army and the ordinary parish priest who is serving for the duration. There are, of course, so many exceptions that I hesitate to generalize, but, broadly speaking, the Regular Army Chaplain would seem to be in some danger of becoming sterilized in ideas and smothered by red tape. His mind tends to become departmentalized and a good deal of his work is bureaucratic. Probably his 'temporary' brethren are not always fair to him. They only see him in his official capacity, usually as their Senior Chaplain, responsible to him for discipline and supervision. I remember my own early experience of my Assistant Chaplain General, and of the highly departmental atmosphere which he diffused and which I found oppressive to the last degree. No doubt he found my own indifference to departmental rules equally

irritating and my evangelistic zeal both crude and tactless. The arrival of a number of zealots creates difficulties for the smooth running of any machine.

I confess that having carefully read the Rev. Joseph McCulloch's chapters in his book *We have our Orders* on his life in the Army as a chaplain, I have some sneaking sympathy with the department that suggested his resignation. I admire greatly his freedom of mind, and I think that his analysis of the general attitude of the Christian towards war, even if it omits something, is sound as far as it goes, but if ever a man was looking out for trouble in the Army I think, by his own confession, it was Mr. McCulloch! No doubt it is the right thing sometimes to stir up trouble; it cannot always be avoided in the service of truth; but there is such a thing as a gratuitous looking for it, and Mr. McCulloch would almost seem to have done that in the first instance by becoming a chaplain. Though it is not the chaplain's duty to stimulate morale, still less is it his duty to impair it. The whole art of war is, as we know, sub-Christian, and a chaplain has to accept certain limitations in ministering to those whose duty (presumably Christian, or the chaplain would not be there) calls on them to pursue it with vigour. There are certain aspects of the Christian life and certain virtues that cannot be presented effectively in war-time. There are occasions when it is necessary to choose one's subjects for preaching or even for conversation with careful judgment. Compare an address to a battalion going immediately into battle; a conversation with men in the front line at zero hour; or a talk to weary men coming out of the line. I can well remember a most godly Commanding Officer hesitating to allow me to take the special service which I suggested for the men of his battalion before their first entry into Ypres. He was doubtful of its effect until he had satisfied himself as to how I should handle the service and what I had in mind. Not long after he was killed on the Somme. To this day I respect and honour his hesitation.

There are therefore two sides to this old problem of the relation of the regular to the temporary chaplain. Its solution would seem to lie in the willingness of each to learn from the other and to share what is best in the tradition or experience of either. I can well imagine a regular chaplain being stimulated and revivified by contact with a keen clergyman fresh from the evangelistic and pastoral work of an industrial parish. I can imagine, too, a parson coming fresh from a suburban parish, with his ideas based largely on work amongst faithful women, needing to be instructed with regard to the masculine element in human nature by a competent and vigorous chaplain who had spent all his life amongst men. There can be no hard and fast rule in this matter. We must leave it at that.

Finally, let me add a word about the general progress of inter-Communion and exchange of pulpits, which is a growing feature of Church life and which is to some extent reflected in the Army, though naturally such developments are watched with anxiety and sometimes frowned on by authority. The Department, being a department, cannot be expected to see King's Regulations discarded or modified without feeling worried about possible developments. There is always fear of a question in Parliament, or that some sticky person or Church authority may demand adhesion to the letter of the law. The caution of the Department may be seen in its attitude towards joint parade services conducted by Church of England clergy and Free Church ministers which are now becoming deservedly popular. They are not forbidden, according to Mr. Brumwell, but chaplains are reminded that

> 'If a parade service be held by a chaplain of a certain denomination, it may be a parade for the men of his denomination, but should only be a voluntary service for men who do not belong to that denomination. In this way and in this way only can combined services be held.'

'This way only' will probably be good enough for chaplains of various denominations who desire to work together. They will not mind whether it is the thin end or the thick end of the wedge which is applied. It is evident that a loophole is being found in King's Regulations, which is all such men will require.

All of us who are interested in the movement towards unity (I am told that the phrase Reunion Movement is out of date with young people) will watch with deep concern and sympathy the psychological effects of this joint work on those serving as Army padrés. What effect will it have on them, and what effect will they have on the Church as a whole when they return to their parishes? Will there be another Padrés' Fellowship after the war, and will it stand for liberty and the preservation of such sacramental fellowship as may have been enjoyed in army days? Some of us in the old Padrés' Fellowship tried hard to preserve it, but the policy of the Fellowship was quickly assimilated to the 'safe' policy of the Church as a whole. The Fellowship ceasing to be a movement of a pioneer kind, lost its *raison d'être* and died. The fire which had almost kindled to a flame was presently nothing but burnt-out embers. A great opportunity was lost.

It is hardly, perhaps, for me to advise my younger brethren who, in their turn, will have some vision revealed to them by the Spirit of God and will, I trust, come back burning to realize it. I will only recall St. Paul's words when speaking to King Agrippa of the action which he took after his conversion. 'Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision.' The Church has a sad record of heavenly visions welcomed with a pleasing facility but discarded when obedience to the inner call was needed for its fulfilment.

THE JUBILEE OF PHILLIPS BROOKS

(1835—1893)

By the Rev. W. G. Fallows, M.A., Vicar of Styvechale, Coventry.

PHILLIPS BROOKS, the greatest preacher of his day, died fifty years ago. Commemoration services have recently been held in many American cities and theological seminaries. In a message to the editor of *The Chronicle*, the presiding Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church says of Phillips Brooks :

> 'He had the happy gift of interpreting the fundamental truths of the Christian religion in such a way as to make clear their bearing on the problems of present-day living. Personally I feel that those who have to deal with the problems of the present day could do nothing better than acquaint themselves with Bishop Brooks' presentation of Christianity as an answer to the needs and problems of his own time.'

A rich man, furnished with ability, Phillips Brooks brought to his task the soul of a poet, the mind of a scholar, the heart of a lover. Versed in the Classics, steeped in the glories of English literature, inheriting from his mother a deep spiritual passion and from his father organizing ability and a care for detail, he found in the parochial ministry the one calling that matched his mental and spiritual equipment. He passed through Boston Latin School and Harvard. After leaving the university he became a schoolmaster but soon resigned, being unable to keep discipline. Thus his first task ended in dismal and humiliating failure. His headmaster said that he never knew anyone who failed at teaching to succeed in anything, but Phillips Brooks was soon to give the lie to this pedagogic wisecrack.

The Theological Seminary at Alexandria where he was trained for the ministry had at that time among its students many ardent spirits who did not apply themselves to their studies. 'These people had plenty of steam but the boiler had no connection with the engine.' It became Brooks' ideal to combine thorough intellectual culture with the intensity of religious devotion. He literally schooled himself. 'If it had not been for something done outside our regular course, I should not have known what study was.' Writing to a friend who was coming to visit the seminary, he says : 'Leave your intellect behind ; you won't need it here.' Throughout his life Brooks emphasized the importance of broad, human, scholarly training for the ministry. No doubt it was with his own experience in mind that he used these words in a sermon preached

in 1879:

> 'With regard to that time (the period of professional preparation) I think that all of us who have seen many men will bear witness that it is just there that many men grow narrow, and from being broad in sympathies, large, generous, humane, before, even in all the crudity of their boyhood, the moment of the choice of their profession seems to make them limited and special, shuts them up between narrow walls, makes them uninteresting to all the world outside their little work, and makes all the world outside their little work uninteresting to them.'

Phillips Brooks preached his first sermon before his fellow students in the sermon class of the seminary. His text was *II Cor.* xi, 3: 'The simplicity that is in Christ.' One of the students said, 'There was very little simplicity in the sermon and no Christ.' Wiser critics saw in it the portent of the great preacher. There were signs that he was already throwing off some of the shibboleths of the Evangelical School in which he had been nurtured while retaining the central evangelical experience of personal devotion to Christ. When the religion of the Church is Christo-centric there is no danger of licence or anarchy. There will be developed a larger Christian Church for all the world whose marks will be unification and simplicity. This was the message at the beginning. It echoed in a thousand variations to the end of his days.

Philadelphia was the scene of his early ministry. Here the preacher and the social reformer vied with each other for preeminence. He denounces slavery, 'the blackest stain upon our country and the cause of all the ruin and bloodshed and affliction that have been visited on our land.' During the Civil War, when most pulpits were silent, his was loud in support of the Government, for the abolition of slavery and the preservation of the Union. He found no place for compromise on this fundamental issue and the prevarication of the Church roused his indignation. After the Pittsburg Convention in 1864 he writes:

> 'Our Convention was a shameful failure. We asked that body of Christian Ministers and Laymen to say that treason was wicked and slavery a sin. They declined, and substituted some feeble platitudes done up in wretched rhetoric which meant nothing and said it. I was ashamed of my church. . . . Oh! how I hate this miserable conservatism. I almost cried for the Church at Pittsburg.'

He advocated the vote for the emancipated slaves and education to qualify them for it. Politically progressive, he alarmed his father, who feared he was becoming a radical and introducing politics into the pulpit. To many it did seem like radicalism, but 'Christianity,' he said, 'is the radicalism of the world.' In the work of reconstruction after the war he was the spokesman for Philadelphia:

> 'What we have to do is to look upon the end of the war as accomplished and to treat the people of the South as though never estranged from us. We must alleviate the sufferings there, and open the way to happiness and remove as far as possible the ravages that have taken place. . . . This will be the surest means of reconstruction — the right sympathy of hearts.'

Phillips Brooks was a leading and influential citizen. It was in him to be a national social reformer, using the platform and the pulpit as levers of power. But when he embarks on his long Boston ministry he gives himself entirely to his parish and the preacher's task. He still occasionally addressed himself, especially in Thanksgiving Day sermons, to the political and social questions of the hour. But he was not identified with them in Boston as he had been in his Philadelphia days.

The preacher in him had gained the mastery. For twenty-one years he was Rector of Trinity Church, Boston. The pulpit was his throne. Here in the intellectual and cultural centre public interest was attracted to his person and message. There is a ministry to the cultured and highly placed which few men exercise with power and distinction. Phillips Brooks was one of them. People who flocked to hear him were drawn from every section of the community. He was in no sense a revivalist preacher. He had few gestures and no mannerisms. The words fell from his lips like a tornado. His appeal was intellectual and moral. One who knew him well describes the characteristics of his preaching :

> 'A singular absence of self-consciousness, a spontaneity of beautiful thinking clothed in pure English words, a joy in his own thoughts, a victorious mastery of the truth he was telling, combined with humility and reverence and love for the congregation.'

In his famous *Lectures on Preaching* delivered before Yale Divinity School he defines the preacher's art. 'Preaching is the communication of truth by men to men. It has two essential elements, truth and personality. . . . Preaching is the bringing of truth through personality.' The preacher, therefore, must apprehend and live the truth ; he must love and reverence men. Truth is the only valid criterion. 'Say nothing which you do not believe to be true, because you think it may be helpful. Keep back nothing which you know to be true because you think it may be harmful.'

Several times Phillips Brooks was invited to forsake the parochial ministry for academic work. Harvard invited him to be professor of Christian Ethics and preacher to the University. He declined reluctantly after long consideration, but as one of the Chaplains to the University he exercised a great influence over the student world. His one ambition was to be a parish priest. 'I can hardly imagine that any other profession can be as interesting as

mine. I am more and more glad that I am a parson.' The preparation of the sermons and addresses filled his mornings and claimed the lion's share of his time. But he was a greatly valued visitor, especially to the sick, and it is said that he conducted the services with an earnestness that carried even Congregationalists to their knees.

Phillips Brooks was a Broad Churchman. He combined piety and conviction with love of intellectual freedom and breadth of outlook. He was not a pioneer in thought or method, but was fearless in his advocacy of liberal religion. The narrow evangelical doctrine which he had heard expounded in his youth never commended itself to him. The denunciation of intellect as a dangerous guide, the condemnation of natural joy in life and its innocent amusements, the schism between religion and life—against all this he inwardly protested. He departed from the evangelical school in a number of important points. But in so far as the essence of evangelicalism lay in devotion to the person of Christ he remained an evangelical to the end. He resigned from the Evangelical Education Society when that society made tests of acceptance of Evangelical tenets necessary before giving grants for the training for the ministry. He writes to the Secretary:

> 'Only I cannot stand apparently asking as essential to acceptance of a candidate for education for the ministry declarations which I do not hold to be essential, and which I do not think the best men among the applicants will be able or willing to make.'

He condemned a narrow orthodoxy as 'born of fear, and as having no natural heritage either from hope or love.' He saw the great need for the reconstruction and simplification of Christian theology, the value of intellectual liberty, and the peril of a dogmatic sectarianism. At the Convention of the diocese of Pennsylvania in May, 1869, Phillips Brooks preached the sermon which was afterwards published under the title 'The Living Church.' In this sermon he says:

> 'If a church in any way hinders the free play of human thoughtfulness upon religious things by clothing with mysterious reverence — and so shutting out from the region of thought and study—acts and truths which can be thoroughly used only as they are growingly understood, by limiting within hard and minute and invariable doctrinal statements the variety of the relations of the human experience to God; if in any such way a church hinders at all the free inflow of every new light which God is waiting to give to the souls of men as fast as they are ready to receive it, just so far she binds and wrongs her children's intelligence and weakens her own vitality. This is the suicide of dogmatism. . . . What is it that is needed? I say by all means that the first need is larger liberty.'

Phillips Brooks was claimed by other Communions as a common treasure. He preached from time to time in the non-episcopal

churches of America. He favoured the open Communion. It was the custom of the Evangelical clergy to invite members of other religious denominations to remain for the Communion. After the consecration of the new Trinity Church on February 7th, 1877, Brooks personally invited clergy of other denominations to stay for the Communion. His action aroused protests from the High Church party. When his brother Arthur, who followed the same custom, came into collision with the Bishop of Illinois, Phillips Brooks writes :

> 'The position of our church is perfectly clear. The Archbishop of Canterbury himself in the Vance Smith dispute said that the rubric which touches the question applies only to our own people. The more I think of it the more I hope you will continue it unless it is very clearly desirable to drop it. I would not give it up out of mere courtesy to any man.'

The machinery and administration of the Church never greatly interested him. Brooks always found Church Conventions wearisome, though he strove to overcome his repugnance to them in later years. His sense of humour alleviated his discomfort. He writes in a letter :

> 'Only last night did I get back from the ecclesiastical junket which began with the Congress at Louisville, and ended with the ministerial council at Philadelphia. The Congress was ugly. But the saints had good rooms at the hotels, and there were enough of them to praise each other's speeches.'

On another occasion he writes :

> 'I have been spending an hour in Convocation, where that very troublesome creature, the deceased wife's sister, was vexing the souls of Deans and Archdeacons. . . . For the present she is rejected and we must not marry her. But in the end she will get her rights.'

So, too, he watches with some dismay the first Lambeth Conference (at which Bishop Colenso was denounced) : 'The great English Bishop Show seems to be doing nothing laboriously.' His conviction was that the strength of the Church lay in the lower orders of the clergy backed by a large-minded laity. Bishops he held in good-humoured toleration. But his friend Bishop Potter of New York asserts that in later years he changed his mind and recognized that what he thought a calling of dry routine might be transformed into a ministry of noblest opportunities and most potential service.

In 1891 he was himself elected to the episcopate as Bishop of Massachusetts. Strong opposition to his appointment was organized by the narrower Church element throughout the nation. He was accused of doctrinal unsoundness, of ecclesiastical latitudinarianism, or Arianism, and of Pelagianism. Throughout the unseemly controversy Phillips Brooks preserved a dignified silence. Ten weeks elapsed before his election was confirmed. The common

feeling was expressed by one who understood the situation :

> 'The persistent maintenance of your spiritual equanimity and Christian temper has won for you the hearts of thousands of God's people everywhere, during your recent persecution.'

Only fifteen months of life were left to him. During this time he scrupulously obeyed the laws of the Church and faithfully administered them. The bigots had made a mountain out of a molehill, but his reputation, already firmly grounded in the hearts of the American people, was only enhanced by the fanatical zeal of his detractors. His death, just after his fifty-seventh birthday, was felt as a national calamity. A girl of five, when her mother told her with tears that the Bishop had just died, exclaimed 'O mother, how happy the angels will be.'

Student, citizen, preacher, pastor and Churchman, but above all a loving and a lovable personality glowing with human sympathy and spiritual light : majestic in stature, unconventional in dress, simple and courteous, he enjoyed his religion. He had what has been called 'the deep wisdom of fine fooling,' and he exercised a talent for nonsense in little things. The joy of living, wit and humour, social converse, these were for him not incompatible with religion. To turn naturally from one to the other, to be ready for either, was only to recognize the unity of man's existence in a world where the temporal was conjoined with the eternal. A swift transformation from the exaltation of the pulpit to the ordinary converse of life was easy for him and essential for his peace of mind. The note-books in which he recorded his thoughts and observations arising out of his wide reading are full of wisdom and beauty. They breathe an air of charity, tolerance, sympathy and spiritual insight. Harvard in conferring on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity did so in recognition of his eloquence as a preacher, his dignity and purity of life as a minister of religion, and his liberality and large-mindedness as a man. There is no truer summary—'And he being dead yet speaketh.'

THE PARSON'S WIFE[1]

By The Editor.

ST. PETER and the rest of the Apostles were married men. Christ had promised that those who forsook their relations and possessions for His sake should receive an abundant reward (*Mark* x, 29), but His saying does not include forsaking one's wife. This omission seemed so strange in the light, or rather darkness, of subsequent Church history that various attempts were made, so New Testament textual criticism shews, to insert 'wife' in the list of renunciations; but the pious fraud was detected, and so 'wife' does not occur in our English Authorized and Revised Versions.

In the Pastoral Epistles it is assumed that the clergy will be married men, but a bishop is to be the husband of only one wife. Under the influence of Oriental and Egyptian asceticism, supported by the example of St. Paul and some of his recorded reflections on the disadvantages arising from the marriage of Christians, the celibacy of the clergy and laity came to be regarded as an exalted Christian virtue. In the fifth century, when Rome was crumbling under the attacks of the Barbarians, St. Jerome (a zealot for religious celibacy) wrote of a distinguished Roman lady that her devotion to the religious celibate life would still be remembered when the sack of Rome by Aleric was forgotten. Clerical celibacy grew apace, and married bishops became so rare that it is noted of one bishop (Synesius of Cyrene) that when elected to the bishopric of his native province he refused to resign his wife; but being too valuable a man to lose from the episcopate, he was allowed to retain her.

In the West, clerical celibacy rapidly extended from the episcopate to the priesthood, particularly under the rigorous reforms of Pope Hildebrand (Gregory VII). In the more conservative Orthodox Churches of the East, the rule grew up that parish priests must be married but that bishops must be celibate. By the twelfth century in England clerical marriage had become very rare and was regarded as disreputable, although an English Arch-

[1] (*a*) *The History of the Parson's Wife*, by Margaret Watt. (Faber & Faber, 1943; 8*s*. 6*d*.)

(*b*) *A Puritan Idyll*, or *The Rev. Richard Baxter's Love Story*, by Frederick J. Powicke, M.A., Ph.D. (Blackwells, 1918.)

(*c*) *Dunch*, by Susan Miles. (Manchester University Press, Longmans Green and Co., 1918.)

(*d*) 'The Children of the Clergy.' (Article by Bishop Welldon in *The Nineteenth Century*, February, 1906.)

bishop had declared earlier that he could not believe that the marriage of the clergy was contrary to the Divine will, since the greatest and best part of the English clergy were themselves the sons of priests. Christian commonsense, however, has been defeated again and again by ecclesiastical fanaticism, and so it was in this case. Clerical morality regarded it as more becoming that a Christian priest should keep a mistress than possess a wife, and a number of bishops supplemented their episcopal incomes by granting licences to their clergy giving them permission to keep a 'priest's woman.'

With the English Reformation the primitive Christian right of the clergy to marry was restored to them (although Henry VIII had no sympathy with the practice), and Thomas Cranmer became the first married Archbishop of Canterbury. Queen Elizabeth shared her father's repugnance to a married clergy, but she had to yield to Reformation principles as set forth in Article XXXII :

> 'Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are not commanded by God's Law, either to vow the estate of single life, or to abstain from marriage : therefore it is lawful for them, as for all other Christian men, to marry at their own discretion, as they shall judge the same to serve better to godliness.'

But not too much confidence was placed in the 'discretion' of the clergy. Bishop Frere, in his history of the Church in Queen Elizabeth's reign, puts on record that

> 'Regulations were included for the marriage of the clergy, and no one, not even a bishop, was allowed to marry without first having his chosen partner examined and approved by bishops, justices, and metropolitan or other superior authority. It is not clear how long this strange provision lasted, though it was certainly in working order till the middle of the reign.' (*The English Church in the Reigns of Elizabeth and James I*, p. 36.)

When Queen Elizabeth's first Archbishop of Canterbury, the learned, judicious and courageous Parker, invited Elizabeth to visit him at Lambeth Palace, she expressed her real sentiments by saying, when taking leave of his wife, 'Madam I may not call you, Mistress I will not call you.' The Church led the way in the marriage of the clergy, but it was not until Stuart times that the State followed. Parker took the precaution of legitimatizing his children in case the State should fail to recognize the authority of the Church in this matter.

Of the Tudor married clergy we know little, but it is clear that many of the laity looked askance at clerical marriage and popular superstition expected it to turn out badly. The following inscription in Copgrove Parish Church (Yorkshire) to the memory of its first married rector testifies to the Divine blessing granted in his case to the experiment of a clerical marriage :

'Here sleeps in the Lord, John Wincupp, late rector of this church, which he served for 54 years. Love and Christian peace he conscientiously cultivated. He was hospitable to all, and kindly and generous to the poor. He never prosecuted any man, nor did any man ever prosecute him. Under the protection of the Highest he cherished his wife and home for 52 years and had six children and a numerous household, yet no one of them preceded him to the grave. His death took place on the eighth of July in the year of our Lord 1637 in the 86th year of his age.'[2]

There is evidence that the wives of the clergy in certain cases were as soundly convinced of the rightness of clerical marriage as were their husbands. In Easton Parish Church, near Winchester, there is a mural tablet with a Latin epitaph commemorating the virtues and (we may not unfairly add) the achievements of the wife of William Barlow, successively Bishop of St. Asaph, St. David's, Bath and Wells, and Chichester, one of Archbishop Parker's consecrators in 1559, and the first English bishop to marry. The Latin epitaph (given below[3]) has been thus rendered into English verse:

'Barlow's wife, Agatha, doth here remain;
Bishop, then exile, bishop then again.
So long she lived, so well her children sped,
She saw five bishops her five daughters wed.'

Isaac Walton, the most accomplished biographer of the English clergy, presents us with the portraits of two clerical wives, Mrs. George Herbert, the perfect example of what an English clergyman's wife ought to be, and Mrs. Richard Hooker, a forbidding example of what she ought not to be. As good Methodists have sought to exalt the saintliness of John Wesley by heightening the suffering inflicted on him by his wife, so the virtues of the scholarly Hooker glowed the more intensely against the background of domestic infelicity. It is, however, gratifying to learn that while modern historical research has done nothing to dim the glory of Mrs. George Herbert, it has done much to relieve Mrs. Richard Hooker of the opprobrium cast upon her in Walton's life of her husband.

[2] Hic obdormit in domino Johannes Wincvpp nvper rector hvivs ecclesiae, cvi liiiior annos inservivit. Charitatem et pacem christianam religiose colvit. Hospitalis in omnes, in pavperes benignvs eleemosynarivs erat. In neminem vnqvam mortalivm litem intentavit nec ipsum qvisqvam in jvs vocavit. Per annos liios svb altissimi tvtela domicilivm cvm foveret ac coniugem, sex liberos, et familiam nvmerosam haberet nemo inde ad sepvltvram ipso praeibat. Humanivs et contigit octavo die Ivlii anno domini 1637 aetatis svae 86.

[3] Hic Agathae tumulus Barloi, praesulis inde,
Exulis inde, iterum praesulis, uxor erat.
Prole beata fuit, plena annis; quinque suarum
Praesulibus vidit, praesulis ipsa, datas.

To satisfy curiosity we record that the five bishops were: Tobias Matthew (Archbishop of York), Wickham of Winchester, Overton of Coventry and Lichfield, Westphaling of Hereford, Day of Chichester.

Of the wives of the clergy as a whole it may be said that they were faithful rather than famous. When we note how many famous men in our 'proud island story' have been the sons of clergymen, ranging from Horatio Nelson to Alfred Tennyson, we have the soundest tribute to the quality of their mothers. Charles Dickens wrote :

> 'It seems to me that great men have had only one parent, their Mother.'

One of the most famous of clerical mothers was the wife of the Rev. Samuel Wesley and the mother of John and Charles. She was a saint and a heroine, a woman of remarkable moral, mental and spiritual power. What she suffered was great indeed. One aspect of it, poverty, is disclosed in her famous interview with the 'good Archbishop' Sharp :

> 'Tell me,' says he, 'Mrs. Wesley, whether you ever really wanted bread?' 'My Lord,' said I, 'I will freely own to your Grace that, strictly speaking, I never did want bread. But then, I have had so much care to get it before it was eat, and to pay for it after, as has often made it very unpleasant to me. And I think to have bread on such terms is the next degree of wretchedness to having none at all.'

Margaret Watt in her delightful volume *The Parson's Wife* describes Susannah Wesley as 'a great and noble preceptress.' The following description of her educational method with her own children is worth noting :

> 'None of them were taught to read till five years old, except Kezzy, in whose case I was overruled, and she was more years in learning than any of the rest had been months. The way of teaching was this : the day before a child began to learn, the house was set in order, everyone's work appointed them, and a charge given that none should come into the room from nine to twelve, or from two till five, which were our school hours. One day was allowed the child wherein to learn its letters, and each of them did, in that time, know all its letters, great and small, except Molly and Nancy, who were a day and a half before they knew them perfectly, for which I then thought them very dull ; . . . your brother Samuel, who was the first child I ever taught, learnt the alphabet in a few hours. He was five years old the 10th of February ; the next day he began to learn, and, as soon as he knew the letters, began at the first chapter of Genesis. He was taught to spell the first verse ; then to read it over and over till he could read it offhand without any hesitation ; so on to the second, etc., till he took ten verses for a lesson, which he quickly did. Easter fell low that year, and by Whitsuntide he could read a chapter very well.'

Her husband's parishioners

> 'insisted on coming, unbidden, to hear the religious instruction she gave to her own children, and coming in such numbers that her small room was crowded out, and the jealous curate accused her of holding a conventicle. Mr. Wesley himself was not entirely pleased at his wife's popularity.'

Although Margaret Watt describes many parsons' wives, not a few of the most interesting being derived from the novels of Anthony Trollope and Jane Austen, she makes no mention of

Margaret Charlton, the devoted and attractive wife of the saintly Richard Baxter, minister of Kidderminster. Baxter, a Puritan minister, is not usually thought of as a Church of England clergyman, yet such he was, being even for a short time Chaplain to Charles II. The most delightful picture of Margaret is given by Dr. F. J. Powicke in his rare little volume, *A Puritan Idyll, or the Rev. Richard Baxter's Love Story*. Baxter records in his life of his wife her influence over the people of Acton, who all 'greatly esteemed and loved her.' Her 'winning conversation' drew them to goodness even more than his able sermons. Baxter, the possessor of a powerful intellect, pays a tribute to his wife's 'clear mind' in all practical affairs. He writes:

> 'Her apprehension was so much quicker and more discerning than mine, that, though I was naturally somewhat tenacious of my own conceptions, her reasons, and my experience, usually told me that she was in the right, and knew more than I. She would at the first hearing understand the matter better than I could do by many and long thoughts.'
>
> 'I often put cases to her which she suddenly so resolved as to convince me of some degree of oversight in my own resolution. Insomuch that of late years, I confess that I used to put all, save secret cases, to her, and hear what she could say. Abundance of difficulties were brought me, some about Restitution, some about Injuries, some about References, some about Vows, some about Promises, and many such like; and she would lay all the circumstances presently together, compare them, and give me a more exact resolution than I could do.'

Another of Margaret's virtues deserves special record, her avoidance of anything like professional religious conversation and her detestation of hypocrisy. Her husband said she had 'a diseased enmity to ostentation and hypocrisie.'

The three most notable wives of clergymen in the nineteenth century were Mrs. Charles Kingsley, Mrs. Mandel Creighton and Lady Davidson. The first two wrote lives of their husbands which are among the best clerical biographies. But the two women were in strong contrast in their attitude towards Church life. Mrs. Kingsley kept herself in the background; Mrs. Creighton was always in the foreground. In clerical circles, Mrs. Creighton was known as the 'mother of the Church of England.' Her influence in Church affairs, in her later years, was believed to be immense, especially in the sphere of promotions. We recall a bishop asking in conversation, 'What do you think of William Temple?' We replied, 'He will certainly be a bishop.' The bishop's wife interposed: 'Mrs. Creighton thinks him still too young.'

The best tribute to Mrs. Kingsley as a devoted wife is the inscription on the white marble cross in Eversley churchyard:

Amavimus, Amamus, Amabimus.[4]

[4] 'We have loved, we do love, we shall love.'

The Latin epitaph on Mrs. Charles Wordsworth's memorial tablet in the antechapel of Winchester College, composed by her husband (the nephew of the poet), is judged to be one of the finest ever written in the Latin tongue on a parson's wife :

I, nimium dilecta, vocat Deus ;
I, bona nostrae pars animae ;
Maerens altera, disce sequi.[5]

Not so well known is the simple memorial verse, on the wall of a Gloucestershire country church, composed by a parson's wife on her husband :

'Oxford did give thee two Degrees in Art,
Ere love possessed thee, Sovereign of my Heart.
Thy Fellowship for me thou didst resign
And only death can sever me from thine.'

The wife of Archbishop Randall Davidson, herself the daughter of an Archbishop of Canterbury (Archibald Campbell Tait), was in every way the most perfect example of a clergyman's wife in a high position. In the later days of the Great War when German aeroplanes were overhead, the Archbishop used to go out from Lambeth Palace to visit fugitives taking refuge from the raid. His wife insisted on going with him. 'Nothing exceptional in this,' it will be said, but yet how characteristic.

Lest all be eulogy, it must be admitted that not all parsons have been discreet in marrying, and some parsons' wives have been more a hindrance than a help. Bishop Henson in his recent autobiography writes :

'I used to say, and I believe it to be roughly true, that "fifty per cent. of the married clergy were undone by their wives, and fifty per cent. were saved by them." '

Even the wife of an Archbishop of Canterbury incurred the censure of George III for her fashionable parties on Sunday afternoons at Lambeth Palace, which were detrimental to her husband's reputation. Yet, on the other hand, how very tedious and exacting the duties of a clergyman's wife can be, unless she possesses the saving grace of humour and the patience of the saints and angels. A clergyman dedicated a little book to his wife as 'A Mary in the House of God, a Martha in her own.' Her sister, misreading the dedication 'A Mary in the House of God, a *Martyr* in her own.' remarked 'How appropriate!' It is, however, in her husband's parish, not in her home, that the parson's wife suffers her martyrdom. A touching, if somewhat heartbreaking, little book of poems by a clergyman's wife, judiciously issued under the pseudonym *Dunch* by Susan Miles, presents the sadder and harder side of the life of a parson's wife in the parish. The poem is entitled 'A Reaction.'

[5] 'Go, greatly beloved, God calls ;
Go, best part of our soul ;
O other part, sorrowing, learn to follow.'

'. . . I do not want to decide how many loaves of bread for the school treat
Shall be white
And how many shall be *Standard*.
I do not know whether Palmer's fruit cake is better than Smith's
Or whether Smith's is better than Palmer's.
I do not want to "take a tray" at the Mothers' tea.
I do not want to decorate the church with heavy wreaths of ivy
And of holly.
The holly pricks my fingers
And the spiteful words of the decorators prick my heart.
I do not remember whether the holly had many berries last year
Or few berries.
I do not remember whether Mrs. Paul or Mrs. Knox
"Did" the font three years ago.
I have forgotten to buy cap-wire,
And I have lost the dimensions of the pulpit.
I do not want to ask the schoolmaster's wife to tea,
Or the churchwarden's wife to dinner.
I do not want to organise progressive games
To amuse yelling choir boys.
I have no wish to entertain the choir men.
I shall tell them that it has been a fine day, though cold;
They will tell me that there may be a frost.
I shall wonder whether we shall have skating this year;
They will say that they wonder too, and they will add
That there was no skating last year.
I do not want to "get up" a play with the girls' club;
The girls cannot act,
Nor have they any manners.
Their voices have no inflections. . . .
I do not want to prepare the minutes
Of the Dunch Debating Society.
I do not want to reduce to order
Resolutions that have neither form nor comeliness
Nor charity. . . .
I do not want to visit Mrs. Jolly:
She is aggrieved
Because her sister
Received her *Parish Chronicle*
The day before she (Mrs. Jolly) received her *Parish Chronicle*.
I do not want ever to see a *Parish Chronicle* again.
I do not want to visit the churchwarden's wife:
She will use her saw-like voice on me and will deplore the fact
That I "don't visit."
She will tell me that I should make "quite a nice little parson's wife,"
If only I would give up all that silly nonsense about the Vote
And turn my thoughts to duties
That lie near home.
I do not want to visit Mrs. Green:
She will hint at hateful things
Concerning Mrs. Brown.
I do not want to visit Mrs. Brown:
She will hint at vile secrets
Concerning Mrs. Green.
A village is not a peaceful place
Or a pleasant place:
It is not a little Heaven upon earth. . . .'

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC

How much the clergy and the Church of England owe to the wives of the clergy it is impossible to state adequately. Unlike the wives of other men of the professional classes, the wives of the clergy take their part, and are expected to take their part, in helping in their husband's pastoral work. There are, however, notable cases where the help has extended into other spheres. That great scholar, the late Archdeacon Charles of Westminster, received much assistance from his wife, not only from her intense interest in his studies but in all the laborious work of correcting proofs. She invented a method which made for absolute accuracy in the setting up of type by the printers in the numerous foreign scripts which the Archdeacon employed.

The services of the 'unpaid curates' of the Church of England have weakened support for the movement in favour of the ordination of women clergy. As clerical celibacy increases, the demand for celibate women clergy will also increase. Yet many Church people will agree with the late Dr. Percy Dearmer's emphatic assertion that 'the only women who ought to be ordained are married women.'

But if the wives of the clergy as individuals have not been famous, the same may not be said of their children. A notable article on 'The Children of the Clergy' was contributed to the *Nineteenth Century* some years ago by Bishop Welldon. It was based upon data derived from the *Dictionary of National Biography*. In this article Dr. Welldon showed that the famous children of the clergy (and here he included dissenting ministers) were much more numerous than the famous children of barristers and solicitors, and than the famous children of physicians and surgeons. Dr. Welldon's figures were as follows: 1,270 for the clergy, 510 for the legal profession and 350 for the medical profession. While admitting that the celibacy of the clergy may contribute to the discipline, zeal and strength of the Church as an ecclesiastical organization, Dr. Welldon is convinced that enforced clerical celibacy is detrimental to the best interests of the nation. He concludes his arresting article with these words:

> 'But the point of this article is not that the sons and daughters of the clergy have rendered greater service to the State than any other class. That may be the case; I believe it to be so; but it is not the conclusion upon which I am anxious to insist. It is rather that a State cannot afford to lose the virile and noble strength of its clerical homes. It is that the Church, in forbidding or discouraging the marriage of the clergy, pays regard exclusively to her own supposed interest, and not to civic or national efficiency. For whatever may be the spiritual or ecclesiastical benefit of the unmarried state—if, indeed, there be any at all—it remains true that the enforced celibacy of the clergy is, and is proved to be, necessarily a serious impoverishment of the national life.'

DR. JOAD'S TRAVEL NARRATIVE

By the Rev. A. W. Adams, M.A., Chaplain to the Royal Sheffield Infirmary and Hospital.

THESE are critical days in more senses than one, and it is usual in times of conflict for men to look to their defences, intellectual and spiritual as well as material and military. In not a few instances such an overhauling of the mental armoury brings to light the alarming fact that much of what has been stored there, and in which we trusted, is either broken or rusty or out of date, or for one reason or another unusable. And this is so not only for Christians, orthodox or otherwise. All those who have been at ease in their own particular Zion, religious, agnostic, materialistic, have had a rude awakening. 'If the foundations be cast down, what shall the righteous do?' Obviously he cannot stand still. He must either advance or retreat. And if, in dark times like these, some of the ill-equipped ranks of religion are in retreat or capitulating to superstition, individuals who once wore the badge of agnosticism or materialism or no badge at all may be moving forward to some kind of religious belief.

Such an one is Dr. Joad in his latest book, *God and Evil*.[1] He is on the move, and he is not in retreat, though whether he is advancing in a straight line is not quite so obvious. Nevertheless there must be many of the educated classes who, during the period between the two wars, have occupied a similar position to Dr. Joad's with regard to religion in general and Christianity in particular, and are now acutely aware that it is unsatisfactory and unsatisfying. His reconsiderations, retractions, restatements will not be without interest for them, as they should not be without interest for, nor outside the sympathy of, others who wish to understand the spirit of the age — or rather, perhaps, of contemporary middle age. Consequently, the significance of this book is to be judged, not merely by what it tells us about where Dr. Joad is going, or where he has already arrived, but where and from what he started.

The foundations of Dr. Joad's previous clever, rather slick, light-hearted intellectualist agnosticism were no doubt laid down in the sitting-rooms of similarly-minded Greats men in the Oxford of his time. 'I was never,' he says, 'a very good rationalist of the straiter sect. I never believed, for example, that matter was the only form of existence, that freewill was an illusion' (p. 14). Hating injustice and cruelty, he confesses that he was absorbed in the intellectual life to the ignoring of morals, except in so far as

[1] *God and Evil*, by C. E. M. Joad. (Faber & Faber, 1942; price 8*s*. 6*d*.)

they are a department of the intellect — amoral if anything, the only self-discipline he imposed on himself being that of keeping himself in intellectual and physical trim in order 'to get the best out of life.' Withal selfish, predatory, shameless, 'there were certain virtues, chastity and humility, for example, to which I was almost a complete stranger.'

Nevertheless, since his interests were largely intellectual, he was not uninterested in the ultimate problems of religion. Rejecting materialism, he believed in the objectivity and real existence of the values of truth and beauty, and attempted to synthesize his beliefs philosophically in a modified form of vitalism. Further than that he did not go, except to suggest tentatively an Aristotelian type of theism. But, as has been pointed out so often before, Aristotle's Unmoved Mover outside and unconcerned with the universe is not one to attract religious devotion or moral endeavour. Otherwise a religious philosophy was uncongenial and unsatisfactory, one reason being the

> 'high and mighty "Thus saith the Lord" attitude to meaningless or dubious propositions, which constitutes to many modern minds one of the greatest obstacles to the acceptance of the religious hypothesis. For many of us it *is* a hypothesis and we must, therefore, be given reasons for adopting it' (p. 32).

But there were other difficulties in the way of theism. Some were logical, and, it must be said, rather shallow ones, in view of the better-informed religious philosophy and philosophical theology of this century. Others were the presence of evil and imperfection in the evolutionary universe—its general untidiness from the point of view of academic and intellectualist philosophy, which if it did not rule out, did not 'prove' an all-good and all-wise Creator. It was from this standpoint that Joad indulged in religious controversy during most of his adult life. But

> 'the many words I wrote and said were not the expression of a mind engaged in thinking things out afresh, but of a mind which was living on the deposit of thought that it had laid down in the past' (p. 14).

What is it that has led Dr. Joad to change his mind so radically? Primarily, and paradoxically, the obtrusiveness of evil which the events of the last few years have forced on his attention as never before, and this is a thread which runs throughout the book. But whereas before the problem of evil was more a matter of academic interest, and mainly negative in its effect on his thought, it is now the one problem, a practical problem, that demands a solution before all others, not only for thought, but for life and living.

> 'Evil to-day so invades the consciousness that one cannot, with the best will in the world, ignore it, and, paradoxically, it brings not so much a belief in God as the need to believe' (p. 109).

> 'To be confronted with a universe which contains evil as an ultimate and ineradicable fact, to know that there is no defence against it save in the strength or rather in the weakness of one's own character, no hope of overcoming it save through the efficacy of one's own unaided efforts—*this* I find to be a position almost intolerably distressing. For one cannot help but know that one's character is *not* strong enough, one's efforts *not* efficacious. . . . Our burden in the world, as it has become, is indeed greater than we can bear, if we have nothing more secure to rely upon than the integrity of our own puny reasons and the wavering uncertainty of our own ethical judgements' (pp. 110-111).

That such evil as he sees in the world is unreal he dismisses with scorn. That it is a by-product of evolution which will ultimately disappear as the process reaches higher levels he will not admit, since it is 'a brute fact rooted in the heart of things, and not to be eliminated or overcome' (p. 176). But if 'the problem of evil, so far from discrediting theism entails it,' yet 'the existence of a single all-good and all-embracing God and the fact of evil are two incompatible facts.'

That is the dilemma so far. But it should be noted on the other side that Joad really overstates his case. To begin with, it is a pure assumption that evil is 'endemic in the heart of man,' 'an ultimate and ineradicable fact rooted in the heart of things and not to be eliminated or overcome.' Is it *true* that evil is as secure as ever it was? Moreover, for Joad evil means pain and suffering, not only as it afflicts humanity, but throughout the animal kingdom, and he is appalled by its pointlessness. Indeed, he insists that it is greater than moral evil, 'the greatest of all evils.' One has the suspicion that Dr. Joad is very much afraid of being hurt, and when he says that most people would rather suffer any mental torment than the extremes of physical torture, it still seems to us that the moral evil of those who inflict the torture is the greater evil. Here Dr. Joad hardly writes like a philosopher. In any case, it is extremely doubtful how far the morality or otherwise of the universe can be assessed in terms of pleasure and pain (it is not denied that pain is an evil), nor yet of happiness. But this is not the occasion for answering the problem of evil. It has been done better elsewhere, notably by Dr. Tennant, and, it must be said, stated and answered more convincingly than by Dr. Joad.

But the urgency of the situation will not allow Dr. Joad to stop there. Are there not other factors which may deliver him from the impasse? Dr. Joad, looking more deeply, finds that there are—his own moral experiences and moral needs.

> 'The problem of evil raises in an acute form the issue of morality, for in saying that something is evil, one is saying among other things that it *ought* not to exist, it *ought* not to be done. . . . I have seen that the times are wicked, and I have seen that I myself am wicked; I have come, in other words, to have what is called a sense of sin' (p. 183).

Further:

> 'If the universe has any meaning, then what we understand by moral experience and moral conflict must be part of the meaning. That some things are good and some bad, and that being tempted to pursue the bad, we yet have a duty to overcome our temptation and cleave to the good—these things . . . are facts and for them some provision must be made in our cosmic scheme' (p. 185).

Rejecting the subjectivist theory of morals, he goes on:

> 'I see no way of escaping the conclusion that men and women have moral experience because the universe is a moral universe; . . . they have aesthetic experience because the universe is an aesthetic universe; . . . and that they have religious experience because the universe is a numinous universe. . . . Moral, aesthetic and religious judgements *can* be objective in the sense that they *can* refer to and report characteristics of the universe existing independently of the person judging' (p. 225).

Even so, we, and Dr. Joad, have not arrived at a satisfying conclusion. Granted the reality of values as well as of matter, life and mind, we still need a principle of unity such as would make sense of it all, such as would be provided by a creator-God who is a Person, who not only creates the values (and the universe) but one who is transcendent above as well as immanent in them, interested and active in the world. Moreover, the world being what it is, and man what he is, morality needs assistance from without. 'I am not strong enough by myself' (p. 231). (Dr. Joad, it must be confessed, always speaks of 'grace' as an external, and therefore unmoral and impersonal force.)

Such a Being, the great religions claim, exists and can be known. But is the wish father to the thought? 'Christianity makes a merit of belief; the mere fact of believing is a sign of virtue, the failure to believe wickedness. Also the wicked are persecuted' (p. 258). And is not the ascription of personality to the Ultimate all too human? 'If God *is* a personality, He is so only by a courtesy title. For He must, it seems to me, be very much more.'

> 'I have suggested that goodness, truth and beauty are aspects of God under which He reveals His nature to man, so that in pursuing truth, we draw nearer to God; in knowing beauty, we know something about God; in doing our duty, experience something akin to His experience. But nobody would, I imagine, wish to suggest that God *is* beauty or *is* goodness or *is* truth. In the same way . . . God may be a spirit, one aspect of whose being may be not inappropriately conceived after the model of an infintely good, wise and powerful person; but to suppose that God was such a person would be like supposing that an object was the shadow which the object cast' (p. 263).

There is, however, one class of testimony which is neither assertive nor inferential nor hypothetical—that of the mystics, which claims direct intuitive experience and knowledge of the final Reality. If we could be sure that this were valid, the end of the quest would be in sight. But Dr. Joad notes two difficulties. For while in the West mysticism does affirm a personal Being, the

East is aware only of an impersonal Other in which all individuality, all appearances, good and evil alike, are swallowed up. If East and West do not cancel one another out, they take us no further. In any case, the mystic experience is *sui generis*, incommunicable in the last resort, and its validity or otherwise can be attested only by one who has known its ecstasy.

Dr. Joad, therefore, must speak of what he knows, and he is again thrown back on his own experience, aesthetic, moral and religious. It is here, and especially in listening to great music, that he is convinced as by nothing else that he is in contact with something other and greater than the self. Here, in fact, *is* Reality, though (again like the mystic experience) it is not communicable in words. If, however, it be objected that conviction is no guarantee of truth, Dr. Joad points out that as a tree is known by its fruits, so experience is to be judged by its effects. To have experience of this kind brings not only peace and unity to the self, release from inner conflict and unworthy desire, but also 'growth in grace'—*i.e.* growth in perception and enjoyment and possession of what is beautiful, good, and true. This could hardly be so if these things, and the experience of them, were illusory.

> 'Those to whom moral, aesthetic and mystical experiences are more or less continuously vouchsafed, by whom what is good, what is true, what is beautiful and above all what is sacred are more or less continuously known, will be found to exhibit these characteristics in their personalities' (p. 289).

Such a man was Socrates, and

> 'As with Socrates, so in their natures and degrees is it with all the great religious teachers and the livers of godly lives, with Buddha and Confucius, with Lao Tse and Saint Francis and Father Damien, with the mystics, above all with Christ himself. . . . What is true in a greater degree of these outstanding personalities is true in a lesser degree of other men and women. With surprising unanimity, in every age and in every civilization, men have recognised the good man. By their fruits we know them. In the last resort, the strongest argument for the existence of a reality other than that of the familiar world, a reality which is in some sense the true home of man's spirit, . . . is the testimony of the lives and the characters of the thousands who have believed in it and have lived in accordance with their beliefs' (p. 289).

This somewhat pedestrian account of Dr. Joad's religious quest is, it is hoped, justified in view of the fact that more interesting than the point of his arrival is how he got there, and should send the readers of this summary to the book itself, always lucid, charged with eloquence and wit (not always kind, and sometimes cheap). So far so good. But the last chapter, which examines the Christian claim, is disappointing and on a much lower level. It almost seems that, having tentatively sided with theism as a possible hypothesis, Dr. Joad is determined at all costs not to go a step further and become a Christian theist. At any rate it is diffi-

cult to resist the suspicion that he has willingly allowed himself to be misled by crude statements which bear little relation to the Christian religion as we understand it, nor is this excused by his protests that he is unqualified to enquire for himself into what might be considered authentic in the gospel narrative or what is the real and unchanging element in Christian doctrine. Dr. Joad surely knows where intelligent modern guidance could be found. But what are the authorities to which he goes for an interpretation of Christianity? Mr. Christopher Hollis of the *Tablet*, Mr. C. S. Lewis, Dr. Edwin Bevan — and the Athanasian Creed. These, as might be expected, provide some carefully selected targets for an attack on traditionalist, ecclesiastical and authoritarian Christianity; especially as regards the Virgin Birth, the Physical Resurrection and the traditional Incarnation Theory. It is needless to quote them or Dr. Joad's criticisms. The former will make some of us shudder; the latter (though not always in the best taste) are for the most part deserved, and Dr. Joad gives some shrewd knocks — for example, the consequences for such as Socrates and Plato of the doctrine *extra ecclesiam nulla salus*. Dr. Joad asks with reference to the Creeds:

> 'If they are not believed . . . why are they repeated? If, to come to the real point, the Athanasian Creed no longer forms part of the Christian Faith, why are we not told so?' (p. 313).

Although on this point we sympathize with Dr. Joad, we would remind him that there are other forms of Christianity besides the dogmatic and authoritarian, and that it is possible to be a Christian and even a Churchman and yet to follow reason wherever it leads, 'to proclaim the truth that I see and, even more important, not to proclaim the truth that I do not see' (p. 294).

More surprising — indeed exasperating — is his unsympathetic reading (or rather misreading) of the character of Jesus.

> 'I was dismayed by the spate of bitter denunciation which the least hint of intellectual disagreement brings down on the heads of the disagreers' (p. 320). 'Recognize Me, or it will be the worse for you, is not the sort of thing that one expects from the founder of the religion of love. But, though Jesus continually preaches the virtues of loving, I can find little evidence that He practised them. . . . He abuses men of learning, denounces the critical attitude in order to throw into relief that of unquestioning acceptance, and tells people that it is only if they become as little children, and therefore as innocent and, presumably, as ignorant as little children, that they can hope to understand Him and be saved' (p. 321). 'We search His sayings in vain for any statement on art, music, science, philosophy, while problems of sexual relationships, of politics and economics, are to all intents and purposes ignored' (p. 322).

It is not proposed, nor is it necessary here, to comment on these *dicta*, save to remark that if Joad can see no more and no further than this, it is disappointing indeed. But the Epilogue, which contains his second thoughts, and better thoughts, gives a fairer

estimate:

> 'I do not want to suggest that Christ's doctrines are not wise and true, perhaps the wisest and truest that have yet been preached to mankind. They are, indeed, so true and so wise that they may be open to criticism on the ground that they are too good for us. . . . But that His doctrines are indeed true and wise and good may, I think, be deduced from three circumstances. First, the most important of them are taught by all the other great religious teachers. I find this fact highly significant. . . . Secondly, there is the test of intuitive recogntion. The human spirit yields an immediate acquiescence to the truths that Christ taught. . . . Thirdly, there is the test of effects. . . . It is, I think, undeniable that there have been occasions when men's conduct has been better, occasions when it has been worse, and I would suggest that at least on some occasions . . . the betterment may not have been wholly unconnected with the prevalence of Christian belief. At any rate, when it has been worse, the decline has often been associated with a decline of Christianity, as, for example, at the present time. With the decline of Christianity something has faded out of Western civilization; a vitalizing, a humanizing, a refining and a restraining influence has been withdrawn. We may not be able to go back to Christian orthodoxy, but of something that we have come to know as the Christian spirit our world stands desperately in need. In so far as Christianity is a system of doctrines and institutions, it may well be that it has outlived its day, . . . but if by the word "Christianity" we mean a certain quality of experience which is the source not only of the doctrines and institutions, but of all those major virtues which good men have exhibited in all ages and countries, of compassion, understanding, kindness, gentleness, unselfishness and tolerance, then certainly what we need is Christianity. In this sense, then, of the word "Christian," what society requires is not less but more of "Christian" effects' (p. 351).

Dr. Joad will, no doubt, receive more kicks than ha'pence from the religious reviewers of his travel narrative, not only for his almost wilful misrepresentation of Jesus in the last chapter, but also for his occasional flippancy and lack of good taste and insight. Yet it would be churlish to withhold sympathy and goodwill from one who, however perverse he may seem to be in some issues, has at last forsaken his intellectualist stronghold (which was not so strong) to come to grips with fundamentals. Some time ago, noting that he was on the move, we suggested that it was time he came over into Macedonia to help us. As yet he has but arrived at Samothrace, or perhaps Neapolis, but if he is in earnest he will not stop there. It is either forward or back. It might well be forward if Dr. Joad could ground himself on a different version of Christianity than that which he has rejected, and on a philosophy of religion which does not start out from the problem of evil and is based on experience rather than on logic. Might we suggest M. G. Glazebrook's *Faith of a Modern Churchman* as a beginning, together with Dr. Tennant's *Philosophical Theology* and Oman's *Natural and Supernatural?*

Meanwhile we wish him *bon voyage* and ultimate arrival in that harbour for which all genuine truth-seekers are bound.

PREACHING THE WORD

A paper read to the Stafford Lay Readers' Study Circle by Prebendary T. F. Royds, Rector of Haughton and Rural Dean of Stafford.

I. *The Importance of Preaching.*

WHAT place should preaching hold in the work of a Lay Reader? We speak of the Word and Sacraments. Note the order. The New Testament does not exalt the Sacraments above the Word. What is more, Baptism is the *chief* Sacrament. And the only reference to the Sacraments in the three Creeds is 'I believe in one Baptism for the remission of sins.'

Now it may fairly be argued that the Church of the twentieth century is not the Church of the first, and that what the infant Church needed in its cradle is not the same food as it needs when full-grown. But the teaching and practice of Christ and his Apostles cannot count for nothing. Preaching had to come first, of course; but even after the disciples had learned to break the bread from house to house we do not find any authority for saying that preaching gradually took a second place and was esteemed to be of comparatively minor importance. Nor does the New Testament encourage us to say that preaching is merely human while the Sacraments are divine: in other words, to contrast our own feeble efforts with the power of God. The original meaning of the Greek word *kērussein* (κηρύσσειν) was not to preach a Sunday sermon to converted people as a routine duty, but to proclaim the good news to a pagan world. It is coming into its own again in that very sense. England needs reconverting to Christianity, and it will not be done by frequent celebrations of what is to some the chief Sacrament. The Word must come first. We must preach and teach diligently (*i.e.* lovingly) if people are to understand and appreciate the Christian Religion. Many professing Church people are non-communicants or very irregular communicants, but few are beyond the reach of good preaching; and it is our business to make it as good as we can. It is indeed the only way to reach those who remain outside, and then only by open-air, broadcast or printed sermons. Those of us who cannot broadcast our sermons must labour all the more strenuously to make our hearers feel that the sermon is part of a church service, and that nothing can take the place of hearing it in its proper setting. So far as in us lies, we must not give them an excuse for saying that they can hear something much better without the trouble of going to church. Apart from the duty of public worship, what is the main object of going to church? Or rather, what was it when there was no B.B.C. and no

printing? This is the opinion of St. Bernardino of Siena (1380-1444):

> 'And if of these two things you can do only one, either hear the Mass or hear the sermon, you should let the Mass go rather than the sermon. . . . There is less peril for your soul in not hearing Mass than in not hearing the sermon.'

Humbert de Romans (*c.* 1277), one of the greatest of the Dominican Ministers General, observes that

> 'Christ only once heard Mass; there is no evidence of His having been shriven; but He laid great stress on prayer and preaching, especially on preaching.'[1]

II. *Hortatory and Doctrinal Sermons.*

Shall we 'reprove, rebuke, exhort'? Shall we scold, encourage, urge, cheer, comfort, soothe and smoothe? Shall we 'boldly rebuke vice'? Or shall we expound the Scriptures and teach? Of course we should do all of these things, but in what proportion? Are people in general impatient of teaching? Well, of course much depends on the teacher, how and what he teaches. Here is the opinion of a famous preacher, Bishop Boyd Carpenter[2]:

> 'I find many saying, I wish our clergymen would really teach us. We do not so much want vehement or earnest exhortation as clear methodical teaching.'

He goes on to speak of a very general dislike of dogmatism, that is, the propounding of theological propositions without relating them to life; theology without religion, faith without works, creeds without faith. But most people welcome interesting and helpful teaching. I will illustrate that by a personal reminiscence.

> Some years ago I remarked to a layman who seldom went to church, 'I've just been to the missionary festival and heard a jolly good sermon by Bishop X.' 'Oh, really?' was the reply. 'Did he tell you anything you didn't know before?' I was not sure that he did, but I was sure that I had been edified.

There is certainly a place for urging and encouraging people to think, to learn, to pray, to give, and to bear witness to Christ; in short, to walk worthy of the vocation wherewith they have been called. But if we do this too often in the same kind of way, we shall bore them. They will say, 'All these things we have kept from our youth up.' Or they will be hardened in their customary indifference to such appeals. No, we must expound the Scriptures, we must appeal to facts and tell true stories, we must apply the experience of the past to the needs of modern life, and we must revise the knowledge of our forefathers in the light of the ever-

[1] Smyth, *The Art of Preaching*, pp. 15, 16.

[2] *Lectures on Preaching*, p. 221.

growing knowledge of our own day. Here is some good advice from the American divine, P. T. Forsyth:

> 'Preach more expository sermons. Take long passages for texts. Perhaps you have no idea how eager people are to have the Bible expounded, and how much they prefer you to unriddle what the Bible says, with its large utterance, than to confuse them with what you can make it say by some ingenuity. It is thus you will get real preaching in the sense of preaching from the real situation of the Bible to the real situation of the time. It is thus you will make history preach to history, the past to the present, and not merely a text to a soul' (*Positive Preaching and the Modern Mind,* p. 166).

We need not swallow such advice without qualification. 'Don't be too lecturesome. People want something to help them through the week.' Such was the advice once given to me by a vicar in my curate days. But I could not help thinking that if I erred in one direction, he erred in another. When I had listened to him for two years, I knew what was coming; I had heard it before. I remember how on a Trinity Sunday of long ago he began his sermon thus: 'Do not let us argue to-day about the doctrine of the Trinity: let us worship.' Perhaps he was right. But he never did argue about the doctrine of the Trinity on any other day, and I never discovered what he believed about it.

Certainly we must not be too lecturesome, for there are people in every congregation who do not want difficulties explained; they do not want to be asked to think, or to make any mental effort. I am sure this is true of the average rustic congregation, and therefore we must beware of raising difficulties in minds which would not otherwise feel them. And when we do try to throw light on dark passages, or on traditional beliefs and superstitions, it is a commonplace to say that we must not be destructive without being constructive. We cannot count on all our hearers being present next Sunday to see us erect a fine new building on the foundations which we have left bare to-day.

III. *The Importance of Study.*

We cannot make our hearers read and study for themselves. We may suggest excellent books, some of them quite cheap, but we may be sure that very few will read them. They do not think of reading as a form of serious work, but as a means of 'passing the time away.' To us it is a duty. If we do not make time for reading, our sermons will gradually become thin and threadbare. 'The sermon which has cost little is worth just what it cost' (Bishop Samuel Wilberforce). I remember hearing Bishop H. S. Woollcombe quote what Frederick Temple said after hearing him read a sermon when he was a deacon:

> 'Yes, ye can preach that kind of stuff for about fifteen years and then ye run dry. Ye *must* read.'

The Rev. Harold Anson in *Looking Forward*, a book worth reading again, quotes a piece of advice given to him by the same Archbishop :

> 'If you must choose between reading and visiting, go on with your reading. If you give up your reading, by the time you are forty you will not be preaching God's Word, but your own word, which is a very different thing.'

How much time can we devote to study, and what shall we study, are questions to which we must all work out the answers for ourselves. Bishop King of Lincoln is said to have recommended the Bible and a good novel. The Bible of course first of all, but who will choose a good novel for us? And if novels, even the best, are to be our staple fare, we shall no doubt preach beautiful sermons, full of pretty stories, apt illustrations and clever character-drawing, all true to life; but we shall remain sadly ignorant of history, science, and the ever-growing accumulation of knowledge which no serious student of the Bible can afford to neglect. This is not the place to recommend particular books, but next to the Bible I would place a good commentary, or as many commentaries as you can afford to buy and keep for reference. The only way to keep in touch with modern thought is to join a library and use it. But there is much that is not modern and does not grow old. The modern preacher can learn something from the great preachers of all time, especially those of the last hundred years. 'Read frequently sermons by the best preachers.' Those are the words of Dr. Montagu Butler in the best lecture on preaching which I have ever read. It was published as a C.S.S.S. leaflet in 1909. I would add, read a book about preaching, old or new, once a year while you are young. Here I interject a bit of personal experience.

> In my first curacy I had plenty of time for reading. But I had to preach every Sunday, after a year of preaching only once a term as a schoolmaster. I bought several second-hand volumes of sermons by great preachers, *e.g.* Robertson, Magee, Caird and Kingsley. Then I made notes from sermons which I could assimilate and use as foundations for my own. It meant that I could always find some solid matter when I was short of it. But I did not copy the language or style of any preacher, however famous.

IV. *Style and Delivery.*

It has been well said that great gifts are sometimes impaired for lack of little ones. A good sermon becomes a bad one if it is badly expressed, or inaudible, or over the heads of the congregation. Beware of the 'cathedral style.' The best illustration of this which I know is Bishop Henson. He is a master of the English language, as well as a man of much learning, and I never read a sermon of his without profit. But imagine yourself reading any

sermon of his as your own to your own congregation. You will see at once that his style is a very bad one for you to imitate. The same is true of most famous preachers and most published sermons. Charles Kingsley's *Village Sermons* are an exception. The moral is, be simple and direct, be natural, be yourself. Talk; do not read an essay or a leading article. Use 'I' and 'you,' not 'we' and 'one.' This, by the way, is the advice of Dr. Montagu Butler, and I am sure he is right. H. H. Farmer agrees in *The Servant of the Word*, a new and excellent book:

> 'The utterly flat, impersonal and insipid "one" should be avoided like the plague. "We" is almost as bad if used too often.'

He compares English with American speech. I have myself often wished to re-write the notice, 'Passengers are requested before alighting to make sure when the train stops that it is at the platform.' In America is would be something more like this: 'Look before you leap! Is the train at the platform?' To come nearer home; it may be that some day you will be taking a tender farewell of your present congregation in words like these: 'One finds it impossible adequately to express the regret with which one will leave St. Mary's. (*Aside*) Thank God I didn't split that infinitive.' But how much better will this sound: 'I simply can't find words to say how sorry I shall be to leave you.'

I confess it irritates me to hear a preacher refer to 'the passage which *we* have chosen for our text.' We can preserve the dignity of the pulpit without being pompous or official—or mendacious. We can talk informally as to friends and equals without descending to slang or trying to excite laughter. Nor is it necessary to preach with your arms, hands or fingers. If you do it naturally it may be very effective, but do not try to learn it as an art.

I need not warn Lay Readers against the parsonic voice. That is the special prerogative of the parson. But there are tricks to which all preachers are more or less liable. Forgive me if the following hints are superfluous. Do not hurry, do not shout, be slow and clear. Every syllable should be audible at the back of the church. Beware of the rapid blurred utterance of the young man about town holding forth to a group of admiring pals, and punctuated by loud guffaws about nothing in particular. Brains Trust, please note! Avoid long words and long sentences. Ponder this saying of a great Cambridge theologian, Dr. Swete: 'When people admire your language, remember you begin to fail as a teacher.' Do not look alternately at your notes and at the roof of the church. Your hearers will not mistake the roof for heaven. Unless you are told to preach at the opposite wall or pillar, as you may be in some large churches, preach at the people in the back seats. It is well to look at those in the front now and then, too. I once made a

practice of listening with my eyes shut, but when I found that a good preacher took it for granted that I was asleep, I gave it up as unfair both to preacher and to hearer.

I have known more than one good preacher who spoiled a good sermon by dull, monotonous delivery, or by reading steadily from a manuscript. Use manuscript or notes, whichever you prefer, but take care to preach your sermon, *i.e.* speak it, do not read it. One of the best sermons I ever heard was from a famous American preacher, Dr. Leighton Parkes, in St. Giles's Church, Oxford, at a Conference of Modern Churchmen. It lasted forty minutes, and he used no notes; but the language, thought and style were all alike so good that it was no effort to listen.

Do not be afraid of preaching old sermons.

> A lady remarked to Bishop Gore, 'I think I've heard that one before.' 'I daresay you have,' replied Gore; 'I've preached it sixteen times already.'

Old sermons are a snare; they can so easily be made an excuse for idleness. But an old manuscript, properly revised or delivered from new notes, will often be better than a new one. Avoid preaching two new sermons on the same day if you possibly can. 'He that preacheth twice prateth once.' Never resent criticism. But do not ask for it except from some trusted friend in private. You do not want either flattery or contempt. Keep a sermon Bible and a sermon register, a large notebook strongly bound. Number each text that you preach from in the Bible, and mark your sermon with the same number. Then enter that text and number in your register, with the date and place of preaching. You will thus have a complete record of your sermons and can refer at once to any of them.

V. *Subjects.*

Shall we choose a subject or a text? How much easier it would be if some authority would prescribe our subjects and texts for every Sunday, like the Psalms and Lessons. But would it? If my own sermon bores me, it will certainly bore my hearers. After all, the choice is wide. Besides, there are all the appointed Scriptures of the day, and the Collect and the Psalms. Your Church paper may help, but usually a week late. When a published sermon strikes you as worth remembering, keep it. I have one by a well-known preacher which was published twice in *The Guardian* with twenty years in between. Which shows that great preachers use old sermons. It was a good one and worth preaching twice.

'Avoid politics in the pulpit.' 'Bring religion into politics.' Which are we to do? I think both. We must let Christ into every room of the house, not only our private house, but the house of the

nation. That is simply the religion of the Incarnation. But party politics are another matter. Christians of all political creeds, except atheistic or anti-Church creeds, must find a welcome in our churches. They cannot answer us back there, and we have no right to tell them which party we think it their duty to support. We must be content to lay down Christian principles. Political nonconformity is a bad model. The pulpit must not be degraded to the level of the platform, for that can be a very low level indeed. No, our main concern is not with man's hopes and dreams on earth, but with God's good news, and we must never lose sight of that high calling. And this brings me to my last and most important heading.

VI. *The Preaching Man.*

The preacher must not only prepare sermons, he must prepare himself. The general preparation of the man counts for more than the special preparation of any sermon. Every sermon must be conceived and born in an atmosphere of prayer. This means more than the saying of a special prayer before preparing a sermon. What is true of study is true of prayer—it must be a habit. Prayer alone will not make a good sermon. When Liddon was asked for a hint about preaching he simply said, 'Take pains.' God will not do the preacher's spade-work for him. If the preacher ever forgets that, he will utter pious platitudes in an impressive voice; and perhaps some devout lady will assure him that it was a beautiful sermon. But depend upon it, some hungry sheep looks up and is not fed. There must be solid matter for the mind, and not a mere heart-tonic, however strong. But perhaps 'solid' and 'matter' are rather unfortunate words. The true preacher is a prophet, an announcer of God's words to men. His theme is spiritual, and his aim is to bring every thought into captivity to Christ, crucified, risen and ascended. His chief interest is not in a land fit for heroes to live in, but in eternal life, the knowledge of God and life in Christ in this world and the next. He can only preach about it if he is living that life now, the life of prayer and worship, based on the first and great commandment.

In war-time the Cross of Christ must be more than ever central in our preaching. It will not of course be prominent in every sermon. Our subjects will vary with the needs of the day and the Church's year. But every sermon should if possible have one leading thought running through it, so that a hearer, if asked what it was about, will be able to give some coherent answer. It must not be overloaded with anecdotes or quotations, or anything that tends to distract the mind from our main theme. We must know when to stop and how to stop, not rambling on till we have no more to say, or till we think our hearers are tired of hearing.

I will conclude with some words spoken by the Bishop of Lichfield in his Diocesan Charge in 1941 :

> 'I would earnestly protest against any putting asunder what God has joined, Word and Sacraments. I think there are just occasional Anglican clergy . . . who give the impression of regarding any other form of worship except the Eucharist as an unfortunate and rather discreditable liturgical necessity which should be disposed of with the maximum of secrecy and despatch. Whereas a really congregational service, with congregational singing, everything done with beauty and dignity, and the Christian message for our day proclaimed after most careful preparation, with something of a prophetic ring about it and in language which the ordinary man can understand — I say a service like this has about it both an edifying and a converting power.'

BOOK REVIEWS

HOW CAN WE KNOW WHAT IS RIGHT?

*Science and Ethics,** an important volume, consists of a short exposition by Dr. C. H. Waddington, the well-known authority on genetics, of the point of view implied in his popular booklet *The Scientific Attitude,* with comments by a distinguished galaxy of writers drawn from the ranks of natural science, psychology, philosophy and theology. Dr. Waddington's thesis is that in recent years ethics has lost its authority in popular intellectual circles through the influence of :

(1) Psycho-analysts, who seem to imply that ethics is due only to our reactions to our early environment ;

(2) Comparative anthropologists, who assert that ethical systems vary, and suggest that they have therefore no general validity ;

(3) Marxists, who give the impression that ethical systems are the irrelevant product of the clash of social forces ;

(4) Logical positivists, who give rise to the view that ethical propositions are ' meaningless nonsense.'

> ' Logical positivism may be described as the ripe fruit of the empiricism of Mach, Bertrand Russell, Prof. G. E. Moore, Prof. C. D. Broad, etc. The empiricism of Hume was based on a psychological analysis of the human consciousness. The neo-Humian empiricism of the Logical Positivists is based on analysis of propositions, especially of meaning. The father of the movement is Dr. Wittgenstein, who has succeeded to the chair of logic and metaphysics formerly held by G. E. Moore in the University of Cambridge. In the preface (p. 27) to his difficult book, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus,* Wittgenstein claims that most philosophical problems are due solely to an abuse of language, and all Logical Positivists limit the range of significant propositions by a logical toothcomb called a principle of verification. For example, A. J. Ayer of Christ Church, Oxford, declares in *Language, Truth and Logic* (p. 15) that "A sentence is factually significant to any given person if, and only if, he knows how to verify the proposition which it purports to express, that is, if he knows what observations would lead him under certain conditions to accept the proposition as being true or to reject it as being false." The existence of God is rejected (p. 174) and as being neither true nor false ; and most of the subject-matter of ethics and of metaphysics is discarded in a

* *Science and Ethics.* (Unwin Brothers Ltd. 1942. 7/6. pp. 144.)

similar manner. Ayer's important book is easy to read and should be read by all those who are not specialists in philosophy but wish to understand modern thought. The Logical Positivists have given us much accurate analysis, but have unfortunately created the impression, especially among undergraduates, that theology and ethics are nonsense.'

Dr. Waddington maintains (p. 10) that, if these four contributions are rightly understood, ethics is just as factual as dietetics, and that

> 'Science is in a position to make a contribution to ethics, since ethics is based on facts of the kind with which science deals' (p. 18).

Psycho-analysis, Dr. Waddington tells us, has shown that ethics is part of the super-ego (p. 11), and that

> 'The super-ego is formed as a result of experience of the material world, and that its propositional content has been verified in experience.'

The experience in question is that it pays to be good (p. 15). In this way, by making ethics depend on experience, Dr. Waddington hopes to smuggle it past the customs barrier of verifiability erected by the Logical Positivists. But, by reducing ethics to a set of rules for psychological health and social progress, he has removed those elements to which the Logical Positivists object; rightly or wrongly, he has played the part of Pétain or Laval to the Hitler and Goering of Wittgenstein and Ayer.

Dr. Waddington makes the interesting and possibly original suggestion (pp. 11-12) that the apparent absoluteness and other-worldliness of ethical rules is due to the fact that they are first formulated in the mind of the child when it realizes, through inability to control external objects as easily as its own body, that there is an external world. Professor J. S. Haldane makes the alternative suggestion (p. 34) that this apparent absoluteness is due to the 'all or nothing' method observed in higher animals for avoiding conflict between antagonistic muscles and between competing reflexes. Dr. Karin Stephen (p. 57) suggests a third possibility, namely, that the feeling of absoluteness is due to the attempt of the super-ego to clamp down unacceptable impulses.

The really important point in Dr. Waddington's article is his answer to the question 'Do we need some external criterion to decide what is the "good" direction of evolution?' (p. 17). He replies:

> 'No criterion external to the natural world is required (p. 17). . . . We must accept the direction of evolution as good simply because it is good according to any realist definition of that concept' (p. 18).

This is the kernel of Dr. Waddington's position on which the main artillery of his critics is directed.

The first question which any philosopher would ask is: 'How do we know that the direction of evolution is good?' Dr. Matthews asks:

> 'This seems to imply that Dr. Waddington has considered the course of evolution and found it is not morally offensive. Now how, on his own principle, could he possibly do that? What criterion did he apply?' (p. 23).

The same objection is raised by Prof. de Burgh (p. 25), Dr. Joad (p. 28) and Prof. H. Dingle (p. 48). Dr. Waddington grows more and more insistent because he does not see the point of the criticism, which is expressed most clearly by Prof. A. D. Ritchie:

> 'I am not arguing, either, that Dr. Waddington's theory is wrong, only that . . . it rests on *a priori* presuppositions it is best to be honest about' (p. 31).

Let us suppose that Dr. Waddington and Prof. Ritchie were arguing about a much simpler question: 'Is there an apple-tree in the garden? Dr. Wad-

dington says, 'There is an apple-tree in the garden.' Prof. Ritchie replies, 'I do not deny it, but how do you know?' Dr. Waddington ought to reply, 'Because I have good vision and I can see it.' In the same way, when Dr. Waddington is asked how he knows that the direction of evolution is good, he ought to reply, 'I can see that it is good, because I have sound moral vision.' All these criticisms by the philosophers have the aim of making Dr. Waddington admit that he could not know that the direction of evolution is good unless he had, in addition to his five senses and his intellect, the capacity of moral as opposed to merely scientific judgement, just as a man cannot appreciate great art unless he has the aesthetic capacity for appreciation. If we are to judge by his correspondence with Prof. H. Dingle (pp. 94-113), Dr. Waddington would not be prepared to make this admission.

His failure to do so does not mean, however, that we can use this weakness as an excuse for rejecting the whole of his theory. We may restate his thesis as follows: 'We must accept the direction of evolution as good because this conclusion is based on a study of all the relevant facts seen in the light of the moral consciousness.' But if we reformulate Dr. Waddington's conclusion in this manner, we are admitting something other than natural science. We can agree with Dr. Burmiston Brown (pp. 49-50) that ethics is intimately connected with natural science because natural science has much to tell us about the results of our actions, but natural science alone is not enough. We may agree with Dr. Waddington that, in forming our moral judgements, we should pay attention to military scientists, sociologists and historians (pp. 94-95). But we must respectfully suggest that poets and prophets (p. 95) have also something to teach us.

If Dr. Waddington's thesis is restated in this way, the question remains, is it true? Is it the verdict of natural science, of the enlightened moral consciousness and of all relevant enquiries that the direction of evolution is good? If we are trying to determine the direction of a river, we must consider its whole course, and not merely a particular reach. If we wish to determine the direction of a spear, we should especially consider the direction of the tip of the spear. If we wish to determine the direction of evolution, we must consider Jesus Christ, who is the spearhead of evolution and the crown of creation, when examined from one point of view, and, from another point of view, one with the Creator. At this point most of the contributors would raise a storm of protest and say that the clear waters of scientific ethics should not be muddied by the turbid stream of theology. When T. H. Huxley discovered that the paths of science were blocked by notices inscribed with this strange device, 'No road, by order. (Signed) Moses,' he uttered a vigorous protest, and rightly so, since the reactionaries were trying to rule out the evidence of natural science. We have an equal right to protest if any worshipper of natural science, forgetting that the true function of science is to follow the facts, and not to exclude facts in the interests of a theory, should attempt to bar from our enquiry the evidence of Christianity, carefully and critically sifted. A botanist examines the flower and fruit of a plant; he does not confine himself to the roots. In the same way, we should not confine ourselves to the *amoeba*, but should judge evolution by its highest fruit, not merely by *homo sapiens*, but by a mutation of *homo sapiens* which has not yet established itself, *homo Christophoros*: the establishment of this mutation and the second coming of Christ to live and reign in the hearts of all men are terminological variants describing the same fact.

If we are allowed to consider all the evidence, we must surely agree with Dr. Waddington that the course of evolution is good. Those who sneer at Christian evolutionists accuse us of saying that progress mounts steadily like an inclined plane, which is manifestly untrue; this is an example of refutation by misrepresentation. Evolution progresses like an incoming tide: some waves fail to reach the high water mark established by their predecessors —

in other words, regression and degeneration frequently occur in species, in individual human beings, in nations and in churches — but the general trend is ever higher and higher.

Two important questions now arise. Granted that the direction of evolution is good:

(1) What is the direction of evolution? What is the one far-off divine event to which the whole creation moves? Dr. Waddington does not explicitly answer this question, so we may suggest that, as regards human beings, the object of existence is the development of character, which is not to be understood in a narrowly moralistic sense, but must include all the good qualities of which man is capable, spiritual depth and fellowship with God, aesthetic appreciation, intellectual keenness and, as long as we are in this world, physical health. Adherence to the more enlightened ethical systems of the world does in fact have the effect of developing character defined in this way.

(2) What is the reason for the sense of obligation which we experience? Whence comes the absolute and other-worldly character of ethics? In Kantian language, how are we to explain the categorical imperative? At this point a distinction must be made. The question why a given individual has a feeling of obligation is, in part at least, a personal and a psychological question; it depends upon his upbringing, etc. The question why does an individual have a feeling of obligation, which varies greatly from one individual to another, is not the same as the question why ought all individuals to have a feeling of obligation to do the right. Some light is shed on this problem by Kant's distinction between the hypothetical and the categorical imperative. A housewife must get her oven at a certain temperature if she wishes to bake a cake. But there is no reason why she should bake a cake, and if she does not choose to do so she is under no obligation to set her oven at the specified temperature. This is an example of the hypothetical imperative. But the same housewife is under an obligation to tell the truth, at least under normal circumstances, if she wishes to do what is right. And it is useless for her to say that she does not wish to do what is right: doing the right, unlike making cakes, is not voluntary; in other words, it is the categorical, not the hypothetical imperative. Now if the reason for our existence on this earth is that we should develop our characters, in the widest sense, by doing what is right, in the widest sense, it does account for the absoluteness of ethics. This is no denial of the logically primary character of such concepts as 'right' and 'ought.' Yellowness is none the less a logically primary concept because we can account for the occurrence of yellow patches by saying that a surface reflects light rays of a certain wave-length. But the sense of moral obligation varies in different individuals—indeed, it seems in some to be entirely lacking —so it may be that it is due not to one cause only, but to a number of causes.

Dr. Waddington's contention that the super-ego, which he identifies with the conscience, is formed as a result of experience is discussed in a correspondence (pp. 56-87) with Dr. Karin Stephen, who points out that the super-ego is often immoral and, in the case of highly developed beings, tends to merge with the ego (p. 61). But the Bishop of Birmingham points out, with reference to systematic thought in general (p. 20) and to this problem in particular (p. 126), that most of our concepts are merely symbols, shorthand devices used to refer to a mass of phenomena. Now it is the case that the class of phenomena normally classified as 'the voice of conscience' does in fact partially coincide with the class of phenomena classified by psycho-analysts as the super-ego, and Dr. Waddington and Dr. Stephen manage to agree on this point.

Miss Miriam Rothschild reminds us (p. 87) that many of those who have contributed most to human progress have been immoral or psychotic. But this is a fact which presents us with no difficulty; an intrinsically ugly patch in a picture may be 'instrumentally good,' *i.e.* instrumental in increasing the beauty of the picture as a whole.

The wide differences between various moral codes are noted by Dr. Waddington (p. 15) and Prof. Ritchie (p. 31). It is difficult to say much on this point since anthropologists are now less confident about their conclusions than in the days when they were shaded from all doubt by the Golden Bough. But the researches of Westermarck and Malinowski have made it abundantly clear that all moral codes are influenced by environmental factors.

In a book of this type there are many loose ends. The Dean of St. Paul's considers that the discussion is disappointing (p. 127) for this reason, but though it does not lead to many positive conclusions, it is very stimulating. The weakness in Dr. Waddington's thesis is due to its brevity and to narrowness in the selection of evidence, but when we widen the field of selection and include data which are outside the scope of the natural scientist as such, we find that Dr. Waddington's conclusions are not wholly overthrown, although modification is necessary.

May we express the hope that one feature of this book will recur in many subsequent volumes? Men of widely separated interests have taken part in this discussion. One of the gravest dangers of modern research is excessive specialization. It has been said that the man in the street goes on learning less and less about more and more, until he knows nothing about everything, while the specialist goes on learning more and more about less and less until he knows everything about nothing. In ethics and theology we do not need further analysis so much as synthesis. The co-operation of theologians, psychologists, philosophers and natural scientists is just as important for the progress of ethics as the co-operation of the United Nations for the prosecution of the war.

This book contains no great learning, but so many view-points are expressed, simply and briefly, that even in these busy days it is well worth reading.

D. E. H. Whiteley.

A PHYSICIAN'S DIAGNOSIS OF CHRISTIAN FAILURE*

This is a book written, according to its author, in haste with neither pleasure nor satisfaction, written because a fire in his bones compels him to write it. His sincerity is as obvious as his deep feeling.

> 'I do not believe,' Dr. Singer says, 'that most Christians have yet even dimly realized how precarious is the position of Christianity, how inactive the Christian fellowship, how hesitating and dubious the Christian leading, and how rapidly Christianity itself is receding.'

He is concerned not at all in these pages with Christianity, either its basic doctrines or its historic foundations, but rather with Christians themselves and their failure in human adjustment to world-situations. For present-day failure is but a repetition of what has happened before, when evil men and evil things have been all too closely associated with the teaching of Christianity and the Christian name.

In the first four chapters we are given a brief sketch of the coming of the scientific age with its repercussions on the religious attitude, the gradual understanding of scientific methods and their limitations, and a statement of the effect of the scientific mood on the character of modern man. The year 1859 stands out, since during it appeared Darwin's *Origin of Species* and Marx's *Communist Manifesto*. The first contained the germ of biological determinism, the latter psychological determinism, and from these followed the doctrine of social determinism. Indeed, whatever our philosophy, the mechanical sciences and their results affect the daily life of all, and in view of the persistent assumption of the ordinary man that science and the scientists can do everything, Dr. Singer's warning is noteworthy:

* *The Christian Failure*, by Charles Singer, D.Litt., M.D., D.Sc. (Gollancz. 1943. 3/6. pp. 120.)

> 'There is no such thing as a universal science as an integrated whole —that is to say, a scientific treatment of the entire universe. It is moreover certain that there never can be. . . . The "universe," without an adjective, includes many things that are insusceptible not only of measurement, but of any sort of mathematical treatement or expression. . . . It has to be recognized that scientific achievement is irrelevant to universal themes.'

At the same time, before the theologians rub their hands in unholy glee, vainly imaginging that now they have a licence to disregard what the sciences reveal, they might with advantage consider whether they always manifest the self-denial, the self-control, and strict regard for truth, the courage and sensitiveness to the thoughts of others, which scientific discipline demands. These are Christian qualities all too often absent in theological observations.

The remaining six chapters, which form the main part of the book, deal with the Religion of Humanity, Christianity facing the 'new philosophy,' historical roots and fruits, the Christian fallacy, and a personal note by the author which might with advantage have come at the beginning. For Dr. Singer the history of Europe is in effect the history of Christian civilization. This to-day is confronted by its negation, Barbarism, while at the same time the Christian religion with its emphasis on ritual and theological niceties has been largely displaced by the 'Religion of Humanity,' which regards man as means and end in himself and is primarily concerned with conduct. The common identification of humanitarian conduct with Christianity is, he claims, unwarranted, since the Religion of Humanity has a philosophic background and a venerable ethic of its own.

The crux of Dr. Singer's indictment of the Christian's failure is that massacre and torture have repeatedly been used by Christian men in what they held to be a Christian cause, and that Christian states have failed to respond to the call of human suffering. His examples range from ancient to modern times during which the major Churches sought to come to terms with evil, and Christian faith has receded as a motive, while pagan faiths flowed in to fill the spiritual vacuum left by a decay of the Churches. Dr. Singer's conclusion is surprising. Neither Christianity as history has known it, nor the Religion of Humanity as we now know it, will suffice; what is needed is *a Prophetic Religion* without ritual or a systematic theology, a religion disentangled from a grotesque conflict with science, no less than from evil ways.

This is a useful book, less from what it says in particular as from its showing how the deeply religious mind of a man, who is a distinguished historian of medicine, reacts to our present moral and religious situation. What is strange is that there is no sign throughout the book that the writer is aware of the existence of a Christian modernist approach to religion, thought and life, which is essentially prophetic and at least tending towards the end he has in view. Dr. Singer may take courage. Not all Christians are blind to the past or to the need and opportunity of to-day.

T. WIGLEY.

WALFORD DAVIES*

There can have been few musicians who have been regarded with greater love and reverence than Sir Walford Davies. His was a truly Christian character. His life was animated by the highest ideals. His talks on the wireless made him known and loved by many who had never seen him. Speaking of his work for broadcasting, Mr. F. W. Ogilvie, Director-General of the B.B.C. has said:

> 'People often say that broadcasting has "made" so-and-so; but Walford Davies, with his seventeen years at the microphone, is one of those by whom broadcasting itself has been made.'

* *Walford Davies*, by H. C. Colles. (Oxford University Press. 10/6. 1942.)

His talks on music were listened to not only by musicians, but also by people with no technical musical interest or knowledge. There was something about his voice and manner which was compelling. His matter was simple and ordinary, but it was presented in a masterly manner. There must have been many adults who listened regularly and with delight to his broadcasts for schools. It was a joy simply to listen to him. On the day after his death a working-man said: 'We always switched on for him. He seemed to come right into the room with us.' He evolved a manner and technique all his own. The story is told of him that he was visiting a family and was introduced to an old lady known as 'Aunt Kate.' She told him that while she listened to his broadcasts, she couldn't understand a word he said. Next week she listened as usual, and nearly jumped out of her seat when she heard him say in the course of his talk, 'There, Aunt Kate, I'm quite sure you can understand that.' That was typical of the man.

As a boy Walford Davies was a chorister at St. George's Chapel, Windsor, and became later one of the assistants to Sir Walter Parratt. From Windsor he went to the Royal College of Music, where, at the end of his studentship, he became a teacher of counterpoint. In 1898 he was appointed organist of the Temple Church, a position he was to hold until 1923, and where he did some of his finest work. In a testimonial he wrote for him, Sir Hubert Parry said: 'He puts his heart thoroughly into all that he does.' That was certainly true of his work at the Temple. It was indeed characteristic of the man. One of his favourite exhortations to the choir was, 'Put your hearts into it, gentlemen.' He soon won the confidence and affection of the boys and men, and of the Choir Committee who were responsible for the music of the services. Very soon, instead of his doing the behests of the Choir Committee, it was the Choir Committee who were doing what he wanted. The standard of singing which he set was very high. He had six practices each week for the two services on the Sunday. No wonder that crowds were drawn to the church by the music. The affection with which he was regarded by the boys of the choir can be seen by the way the choristers clung to their church. An Old Boys' Union was started with a strong corporate life, a life which he fostered so well that it has outlived him and survived the destruction of the Temple Church itself.

During the war of 1914-1918 Walford Davies was active in bringing music to the troops, visiting France in 1916. In 1918 he was given the post of Musical Director to the Air Force, a task he entered upon with enthusiasm. A March he wrote is still the official Royal Air Force March. At the end of the war he embarked upon what we may call, with Dr. Colles, 'the Welsh Mission.' He was appointed Director of Music to the University of Wales. His work was to widen the somewhat narrow limits within which music had been moving in Wales. It was a hard and exacting job to which he gave himself unsparingly. His life was a round of festivals, lectures, concerts, classes. It was a fruitful work which led, among other things, to the formation of the Welsh Symphony Orchestra, and the Three Valleys Festival. He received many tempting offers while he was in Wales, but for the time he felt it his duty to stick to his 'mission.' In 1927, however, largely at the instigation of Dr. Randall Davidson, then Archbishop of Canterbury, he returned to St. George's Chapel as organist, a position he held for five years. In 1934, on the death of Elgar, he was made Master of the King's Music, an honour he valued and made a reality. He arranged, for example, in connection with the Silver Jubilee of King George and Queen Mary a concert of British music which won the tribute from King George, 'Best show I've ever seen.'

A word must be said about the work of Walford Davies in connection with religious broadcasting. When Dr. F. A. Iremonger was appointed Director of Religious Broadcasts in 1933 Walford Davies was associated with him in the choice of the music and the producing of it. Many will remember with

gratitude this work of his. The series 'Melodies of Christendom,' which consisted of a selection of the best Church music of every age, is an example of his work which will long be remembered.

When the present war broke out he went with the B.B.C. to Bristol and continued his work in connection with religious broadcasts. He was induced to resume his broadcasts to schools, and gave a series of delightful talks on 'Everyman's Music.' It was a strenuous task in strenuous days, when the fury of the *Luftwaffe* broke upon Bristol and the other cities of our land. He was taken suddenly ill, and died on March 11, 1941. He helped many to a real understanding and love of the best in music.

O. R. Clarke.

IN A COOL HOUR

Dean Inge in his latest volume, *Talks in a Free Country*,* disclaims the title of Dean, but the point must be settled, not by ecclesiastical etiquette, but at the bar of national usage. He comes in that select class of Deans who never lose the title — Dean Swift, Dean Stanley, Dean Church, Dean Liddell and perhaps Dean Millman and Dean Bradley.

Talks in a Free Country consists of nine dialogues: 'Escape,' 'Miracle,' 'Myth and Mystery,' 'An Urgent Task,' 'Ideals and Idols,' 'The Dismal Science,' 'On a College Essay,' 'John, Jonathan and Fritz,' 'Cradles and Coffins' (I and II). The dialogue mode of expression allows the Dean the greatest freedom in the treatment of his themes and the widest range for his powers of repartee and epigram. Many readers, we imagine, will like the first dialogue best. Here the Dean presents himself as a spectator rather than as a participator in life. A sunset touch, a sense of quietude characterises the discussion of its theme—preparation for embarkation to the farther shore. Those who hold that a good life lived in this world is the best preparation for life in the world beyond will question whether Lord Winterbourne needs any special preparation at all. Nevertheless, uncontroversial thinking aloud upon this theme gives value to life here and now.

The dialogue on 'Miracle, Myth and Mystery' provides the reader with some suggestive definitions of that difficult term 'miracle':

> 'Miracles are objective facts in the visible world — their value to us is as symbols of eternal and timeless truth.'
>
> 'Miracle, which is "faith's dearest child," is the natural language of faith in a pre-scientific age.'

The trouble is that the scientists and historians find strong objections to miracles as objective facts, and our traditionalist dogmatists have no use for miracles except they be objective facts.

It is clear to us that Christian teachers will have in the end to accept the verdict of the historians and scientists in this matter. When they do, miracles will cease to be either a burden or a problem for the Christian teacher. All the modern teacher demands to-day is freedom to investigate all cases of miracles and to interpret them in accordance with the best knowledge available, being convinced that ultimately we must see God working in His universe either everywhere or nowhere.

The third dialogue is on the abolition of war. 'Overcome evil with good' is true Christianity and constitutes the basic axiom of the discussion. Everything depends, however, upon whether force may be rightly used in this process of overcoming evil with good. Dean Inge quotes appositely a Brahmin teacher as follows:

> 'If you desire to honour Buddha follow the example of his patience

* *Talks in a Free Country*, by William Ralph Inge, formerly Dean of St. Paul's. (Putnam and Co. 1942. 8/6.)

and long-suffering. If you conquer your foe by force, you increase his enmity ; if you conquer by love you will reap no after sorrow.'

This is indeed true, but is it always possible? We are convinced that force must be used as the servant of love and, as Augustine pointed out, so Dean Inge reminds us: the interests of the aggressor himself demands this use of force against himself. No conquest of human nature can be ultimate or ideal which is not a rational, moral and spiritual conquest; but this does not forbid the use of force as the servant of the Divine Will in achieving this conquest.

The abolition of war depends upon the abolition of evil from human nature. If we are not ' perfectionists ' we can have no hope for the abolition of war in human history. It is proposed in the post-war period to cure Germany of her war-lust by means of education. This is the only way to cure the human race as a whole. It is not likely to be a quick process.

In ' Ideals and Idols ' the Dean has some pertinent things to say of Democracy, Bolshevism and Fascism. He has an unmeasured contempt for our English Bolshevists — ' the parlour Bolsheviks of Bloomsbury.' Democracy, he holds, is better at destruction than construction.

The Corporate State in Mussolini's Fascism seems to the Dean to be

> ' the one important innovation of Fascism which we may do well to consider. The essence of it is that the nation shall be divided occupationally, not locally, and that each profession or trade shall manage its own affairs . . . . in every administrative board employers and employed shall sit together. I do not know how this plan has worked, but it seems to me far superior to parliamentary Democracy.'

If modern Democracy is going to substitute bureaucratic centralization for representative local government, and that seems to us to have been its tendency for some years past, then we are inclined to agree with the Dean's suggestion.

In his dialogue on ' the Dismal Science ' (political economy) the Dean presents his readers with more problems than solutions. The Dismal Science is no longer dismal. It is the lucky bag into which every modern idealist dips to fetch forth an economic remedy for moral and spiritual ills. The Dean has his remedy: it is not ' more education ' but ' better education ' — ' above all, religion—the right sort.'

We have found the most interesting of all the discussions in this book that entitled ' The College Essay.' It is a mixed grill. One of the themes set for the essay was ' *La propriété c'est le vol,*' which one of the candidates rendered ' Property is on the wing ' and another ' Personality consists in volition.' Although the Dean makes one of his characters say of euthanasia:

> ' As for altering the law so as to make euthanasia possible, I should be in favour of it, though I quite see that safeguards are necessary.'

Yet the Dean himself asserts:

> ' I do not think that Christian ethics will ever sanction the practice.'

In his chapter on ' John, Jonathan and Fritz ' the Dean cites a passage from the American philosopher Santayana which is so delightful to the English reader we cannot forbear reproducing it:

> ' The Englishman is no missionary, no conqueror. He is rather glad if natives will remain natives and strangers strangers; yet outwardly he is most hospitable and accepts almost everybody for the time being. He carries his English weather in his heart wherever he goes, and it becomes a cool spot in the desert, and a steady and sane oracle among all the deliriums of mankind. Never since the heroic days of Greece has the world had such a sweet, just, boyish master. It will be a black day for the human race when scientific blackguards, conspirators, churls and fanatics manage to supplant him.'

We add another quotation from the Dean's concluding paper, 'Cradles and Coffins.' It is from a Japanese writer in 1916:

> 'How our strength grows! In 1895 we conquered China; Russia, Germany and France stole the booty from us. In ten years we punished Russia and took back our own; in twenty we were quits with Germany; with France there was no need for haste. As for America, that fatuous booby with much money and no brains, she is an immense melon, ripe for the cutting. North America will support a thousand million people; they shall be Japanese and their slaves.'

Although the Dean provides us with no Pisgah view of the Promised Land, yet it is evident that his critical eye is not dim nor his mental force abated.

H.D.A.M.

DISESTABLISHMENT—AND THEN?*

The Reverend Joseph McCulloch has written an autobiography, none the less interesting to the older presbyters of the Church because the author is young — young in sensitiveness, in restlessness, in self-confidence. Let us hope he will long retain these incentives to thought and action, whatever other ingredients he adds from a growing experience. Such a mind is very valuable in a society such as the Church, whose lay members are naturally conservative. They like to stand on the *Via Sacra*. McCulloch won't let us do that. He will insist on driving us to the City of God. He must be made a Dean, and not a Bishop. The introduction is written by a Dean, and we may be sure that Dr. Iremonger would not have written for a second-rate book, even on a first-rate subject.

The dominant motive of the book is to advocate Disestablishment, and without delay. The Dean himself has no use for the Establishment:

> 'The terrible anomalies in the life and witness of the Church, in her Courts and assemblies, her administration and her patronage, in the spiritual discipline and supervision of her members; and quite over the whole breadth of the way to the Reunion of Christendom, to pastoral efficiency, and to religious liberty there straddles this terrible Apollyon of the State.'

These jagged quotations show on what grounds the Dean of Lichfield and the Rector of Warley are in such haste to pull down the Established Church of the Nation — and to substitute What?

I trust it is not impertinent to give this advice to those who see in Disestablishment the cure for the weaknesses denounced above, and even to those who think the irrevocable experiment worth making — 'Check your facts, and omit none that are relevant; be sure of your deductions; see your goal with cold clarity.'

McCulloch apparently has no doubts. This is remarkable if he has read and weighed *Les Mémoires de l'Abbé Loisy*. There a damning indictment of Disestablishment is given in authentic detail, and its evils in comparison with the difficulties which so disturb Dr. Iremonger are as typhoid to chicken-pox. The perusal might persuade the Dean and the Rector to think again!

The biographical sections of the book are frank and of touching human interest, but not one of them is of much force in sustaining the demolition of the Establishment.

The author's friends at Oxford, who read ancient philosophy and history, politics and economics, 'made the point that few thoughtful men could enter orders with a clear conscience.' That must have shaken him! On the next page, however, he tells us that the Modernists preserved his vocation. That is an encouraging example of what often happens. Then, he proceeds to

* *We have our Orders*, by Joseph McCulloch. (Michael Joseph Ltd., 26 Bloomsbury Street, W.C.1. 10/6. Published February 22nd, 1943.)

state: 'I would have been gladder to serve a Church for whose ministry many were called but few chosen.' That is a delightful sentence when one considers that in one at least un-established church the author would *not* have been chosen. That he *was* chosen is a strong argument that the old Church is not so bad as the book asserts and implies. Chapter IV on 'High Calling' does nothing to neutralize this argument for the present management of the Church. McCulloch says in its penultimate paragraph: 'the ecclesiastical institution, the Establishment, has a completely disillusioning effect upon them,' *i.e.* the clergy. Has it? Yet, he adds, 'few, if indeed any, clergy ever lose their enthusiasm for the Divine Master.' That is indeed a tribute to the Establishment, when one remembers the revelations of Alfred Loisy, or the works of Fr. Tyrrell.

On page 71 he writes: 'we must throw out the impediments to the love of Jesus.' (I am not sure whether the last two words are a subjective or objective genitive.) My own experience, considerably wider and longer than that of the author, is that the Establishment is no hindrance at all to the love of Jesus for us, or of ours for Him, either in interior devotion or outward practice. Here, of course, I speak for the laity as well as for their ministers. I look back over my life and marvel at the quiet, self-sacrificing and loving lives of so many scores of the laity of the Established Church in every cure I have served. I marvel at the courageous endurance of the clergy of all the schools of thought and practice within the motherly arms of the Established Church. Truly, the Church must move and must adapt its form to changing environment, but this chaotic book does not make out a convincing case for a Root and Branch Measure.

His final effort to discredit the present by no means static organization follows the data given on page 203: 'We have a Church predominantly middle-class in manner of life, moral ideas, general sympathies and mental equipment . . . in a predominantly artisan community.'

Would he not admit that the artisan class is becoming middle-class in all the dynamic countries of the world, not excepting Russia and the Union of Soviet Republics? The hand-workers in town and country are entering the stream of opportunities which have made possible the moral ideas, the general sympathies and the mental equipment of the middle-class. No, Mr. McCulloch, if you refrain from disestablishing the Church the artisans of the developing future will learn to value the stability and tolerant orderliness which its deep roots give to the State. The Establishment does not prohibit changes, but it checks inconsidered rashness.

I must agree with His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury: 'I do not think we ought, at this time anyhow, to embark on a campaign for disestablishment.'

κερδέων δὲ χρὴ μέτρον θηρευέμεν·
ἀπροσίκτων δ' ἐρώτων ὀξύτεραι μανίαι.

Seek thou the virtuous mean: the fierce desire
That lusts for loves forbid, is frenzy's wildest fire.
(Pindar, *Nemea* XI).

W.S.L.

C. S. LEWIS ON PAIN AND EVIL*

'"The door into life generally opens behind us" and "the only wisdom" for one "haunted with the scent of unseen roses, is work." This secret fire gives out when you use the bellows: bank it down with what seems unlikely fuel of dogma and ethics, turn your back on it and attend to your duties, and then it will blaze. The world is like a picture with a golden background

* *The Problem of Pain*, by C. S. Lewis, M.A. (The Christian Challenge Series, Centenary Press. 1942. 3/6.)

and we the figures in that picture.' Mr. C. S. Lewis, an Oxford don, comes to Christian doctrine and the problems of religion with all the warmth and imagination of a poet and lover of language, feeling and expression. He has found religion meaningful and efficacious, and he wants to make its meaning known to others and its power felt. To this task he bends all his literary powers and all his emotional energy. But he also feels that the Christian religion has had a glorious past and is now rather somnolent; that indeed the world has had a glorious past and has declined. There are but haunting traces left which invite and tantalise us creatures of a day with dim visions and hopes of better things.

Mr. Lewis has a nostalgia for that lost glory that was once both on the earth and in the Church. Like J. M. Barrie's Mary Rose he is always listening to catch the distant music of another world. Mary Rose's world is partly an unreal, imaginary life in the golden past and partly an idealistic dream of goodness to be and to be striven for. Her error is that she confuses the two, and instead of striving to make it real loses herself in a nostalgia for an unreal Eden in the past, so that she has no energy to strive to realise the future dream or to adapt herself to the present world around her where she was so much needed and could do so much good. She is not of this world, but neither is she of the future world. She is lost.

The danger is that this nostalgia for the lost glory of the earth and of the so-called 'Ages of Faith' may also lure us into a fairy world quite out of touch with the life we now have to live and unable either to adapt itself to that life and its prevailing thought or to bring other non-professing Christians into the Christian orbit. Mr. C. S. Lewis earnestly desires to bring in such people, and yet the reactions of Mr. C. E. M. Joad in 'God and Evil' to Mr. Lewis' presentation, or at any rate to the language-forms of his presentation of the Atonement, and also to his anthropology and his explanation of the purpose of animal life and animal pain, show that in the scientific and philosophical temperament of which Mr. Joad is an eminent example Mr. Lewis' approach and thought-forms touch no responsive chord; yet these same scientists and philosophers, humbler now than in former years owing to the present catastrophe which mars like a huge wen the fair face of the modern world they loved so much and travailed to create, are searching and yearning for a solution of that very problem of pain and evil which Mr. Lewis has in hand. We must steel ourselves to look boldly forward to the world to come, not backward to the world of a luring golden age.

It is true that there is to-day an equal danger — that of minimising the heinousness and effects of and responsibility for sin. That tendency has long needed readjustment, and no one to-day is inclined to deny either these or the objective and social or cosmic reality of evil. But the way to remedy this is not by propounding 'a Socratic myth, a not-unlikely tale,' which presents a vision of a possible God-centred primitive man who does after all seem to conflict with all the alleged evidence that most primitive men lived a life largely spent in self-preservation and fear and which certainly does not seem likely to the scientists, but rather to try to present the essential truths of Christianity — the truths of the heinousness of sin, the tempering, healing and reconciling efficacy of suffering, the folly and error of a 'man-centricity' and of pride, of the grace of repentance, of the objective power and influence the Cross released in the minds of men and in society to counter the objective evil to be found there — in a simple, coherent and direct form which will be understood and attract the forward-looking energies of men.

Man was made for good and for happiness, and that was in the ground-plan of the world before even primitive man appeared, but it was a goodness and a happiness to be won by resisting 'man-centricity,' pride and sin of all sorts from the first, above all by resisting that particular 'man-centricity'

which would make man merely man, merely part of that brute physical world in which he had to build up his life and his race through striving, pain and suffering till it was firmly established in that promised and intended goodness and happiness.

'*Tantae molis erat* HUMANAM *condere gentem.*'

W. RICHARDSON.

WHY ARE THE JEWS NOT LOVED?

'Scores of books have been published on anti-Semitism, Jewish and seemingly dispassionate books in defence of Judaism, and Christian books, written with a glowing love to right the wrongs of the Jews. But neither kind of book has so far brought forth the hundredfold fruit for which their authors were hoping. True, the place is stony and the seed has not much earth. But are we so sure that the seed was good and able to bear fruit?' (p. 109).

We may concede that the number of books concerning the modern Jew shows no sign of diminishing and the plight of the Jews no sign of improving.

The authors of the present volume are a converted German Jew who became head of the Delitzsch Institute in Leipzig and a missionary of the Church of Scotland who worked in Prague. They insist that the Jewish problem is essentially religious and not racial or political. Dr. William Paton puts this quite clearly in his foreword:

'The subject with which this book deals is one of the most important in our contemporary world. What is called "the Jewish problem" is mainly discussed in terms of emigration possibilities, a national home in Palestine with its relation to the Arab world, or the economic future of eastern Europe, or "anti-Semitism." But there is among the mass of Christians a failure to probe to the deeper levels of the problem and to face the religious questions which the juxtaposition of "Christendom" and "Jewry" necessarily raises.

'Jewry rests in the last analysis upon religion; the existence of secularised Jews and the wide divorce in many countries, notably in America, between the mass of Jews and the synagogue ought not to obscure from us the fact that the *differentia* of Jewry is religion. It is a covenant people. Christianity is not merely a mode of culture, it is religion based upon revelation with a claim that it is either absolute or nothing. How is it possible to consider "the Jew in the Christian world" without facing the religious issue?'

The modern phase of the Jewish problem is traced back (p. 25) to the French Revolution. The doctrine of the Rights of Man was applied alike to the Jews and to negro slaves with far-reaching results. Men became individuals and ceased to be members of classes, privileged or unprivileged. The Jew emerged from the ghetto and became a full citizen, practising indeed a different religion, but to the polite impartiality of the eighteenth century Judaism and Christianity were parted only by speculative differences about which it was absurd to quarrel. The Jews ceased to be a class oppressed, but tolerated and recognised: they achieved full civic rights but lost their own communal position. At present in many countries they have lost civic rights without returning to their previous communal status. In many cases they have abandoned their religion and feel that they have little in common with their practising fellow-Jews. They were often anxious to forget that they were Jews: their principal social aim was to be accepted as Gentiles.

For the orthodox Jew there was always the problem of divided allegiance to his community and to the state in which he was permitted to exist. The liberal Jew thought that he had escaped from this dilemma, but it re-appeared.

No man owes loyalty to a state which spurns him. So the liberal Jew, denied assimilation, turned to Jewish racialism and sought to realise a materialised Messianism through Zionism, the reconstitution of a Jewish state in the traditional home, the kingdom of God without God.

But the authors of *The Jew in the Christian World** are less concerned with the dead-end reached by the liberal Jews than with the orthodox Jews who still cling to their community. Mr. Kosmala points out the covenant basis of Judaism resting upon descent from Abraham and the rite of circumcision, which precludes Judaism from ever being an individualistic religion. Similarly he indicates how the revelation of Sinai was given once for all, just as for the Christian the Incarnation is final. He traces the interesting attempt through Noachism to retain the privileges of descent from Abraham and yet to offer hope to the better kind of Gentile at the last day. According to tradition 'the sons of Noah were given seven commandments: in respect of idolatry, incest, shedding of blood, profanation of the name of God, justice, robbery, cutting off of flesh or limb from a living animal.' This is much as if the Christian missionary were graciously to admit the possibility of salvation to such heathen as accepted the commonplaces of natural theology and of the law of nature.

Most of those who deplore anti-Semitism refuse to consider why Jews are disliked. The reasons are not far to discover. Some of them may be found in the Bible, *e.g.* exclusiveness and vindictiveness. The books of *Nahum* and *Esther*, the story of Jael, and the beginnings of the Samaritan schism show up the Jews in an unamiable light. The student of the O.T. is seldom filled with admiration of the Jews as the classical scholar comes to love the Greeks. Again, it is noteworthy that the British officials in Palestine have been accused of partiality to the Arabs. They find much the same difficulties in ruling Jews as confronted the Romans. This is mainly because the Jews are intractable and obstinate. They may have many virtues, but they lack moderation and tact. To display different virtues and vices from those of your neighbours will always bring unpopularity upon you: either you will be a scoundrel for your exceptional vices or a prig for your exceptional virtues. A nation of shopkeepers has a certain natural affinity with a commercial race, but this is diminished if the commercial morality of the commercial race is suspected of being lower.

Many people when young are instructed to avoid having dealings with Jews. To elude their caution Jews often change their names, and in the East End of London to put the name of a company above a shop is to attract suspicion of Jewish ownership. The numerous convictions of Jews for black market offences are doing much to make them disliked. Again, it would seem prudent if Jews, knowing themselves unpopular, kept as far as possible out of the public eye, but in democratic countries they are prominent in politics.

The Jews may be compared, at least as far as this country is concerned, with another minority, the Roman Catholics. Both are often disliked; moreover, the Roman Catholics are feared. But no one proposes to expel them or to diminish their rights. For one thing, they are not easily recognisable as such. Again, they are more dangerous, for they belong to a powerful international organisation whose rigid principles are more likely to clash with the modern secular state than the more flexible Jewish community. If, then, the Jew is loathed as the Catholic is not loathed, it must be because of his personal qualities.

Mr. Kosmala gives a slight sketch of anti-Semitism ancient and modern, which is perhaps the least satisfactory part of the book. He fails to distinguish the dissimilar character of anti-Semitism in the Christian and the pre-Christian world, and scarcely mentions the fairly complete records of anti-Semitic agita-

* *The Jew in the Christian World*, by Hans Kosmala and Robert Smith. (S.C.M. Press. 6/-. 1942.)

tion which we have for Alexandria. In his discussion of these (*Journal of Roman Studies*, 1941, p. 16) Mr. H. I. Bell remarked:

> 'The establishment of Christianity as the State religion did not lessen anti-Semitic feelings: it actually intensified it. To the pagan Greeks the Jews were merely unpleasant neighbours who stood aloof from the religious observances of the city, took but an imperfect part in its social and civic life, and had a detestable habit of siding with the dominant power against the local opposition: to the Christians they were the stiff-necked people who had rejected the Messiah and crucified the Divine Son of Man. Thus racial prejudice was reinforced by religious fanaticism.'

It may well be doubted if MM. Kosmala and Smith have made out their contention that the Jewish problem is essentially religious rather than social and political. The Jewish problem was once purely religious, and till recent times could be solved quite simply by conversion, spontaneous or enforced, but the religious aspect is now subordinate. The Jew does not cease to be a Jew by becoming a Christian. He cannot rid himself of his disabilities at the price of apostasy. He is oppressed not in order that he may repent and become a Christian, but because of his birth. So that the title of this work, *The Jew in the Christian World,* is misleading. So far from the world being Christian, the medieval conception of Christendom has long since ceased to have significance. Jews are no longer punished because their ancestors had Christ crucified. They are punished with a view to expelling or eliminating them. Whether they attend the synagogue or not is immaterial.

When the Jewish problem is thus admitted to be essentially secular in character, its difficulty becomes clearer. There are a number of kindly but short-sighted people in this country who deny that there is a Jewish problem. They concentrate their attention on the cruel methods employed in Fascist countries against the Jews and fail to enquire at what the persecutors are aiming. They omit to ask the ultimate question, 'Are the Jews an asset to the state?' This is not an easy question to answer and certainly is not answered by a list of eminent Jewish scientists, writers and artists. The Fascist readily and sincerely answers 'No.' Therefore the Fascist takes drastic measures to rid the state of what he considers a harmful element. This leads to an influx of Jews into other states where the problem is quiescent.

Where the Jews are a weak and insignificant minority they may easily be tolerated, though they are never loved or admired. Some of them may be assimilated and accepted on equal terms by Gentiles. But the Fascist will not tolerate even these. He insists upon investigating pedigrees and reckons as Jews those with even one Jewish grandparent. In order to be rid of the Jews, hatred is stirred up, often on flimsy or inconsistent grounds. The Jew may be denounced as a capitalist or as a Bolshevik. This argument may conveniently be exposed in a pseudo-syllogistic form:

> All capitalists are wicked;
> some capitalists are Jews:
> therefore all Jews are wicked.

Mr. Smith argues (p. 142):

> 'It seems that there is a definite saturation point, and that when that point is reached any further Jewish admixture produces anti-Semitism almost automatically. Normally the safe percentage is about five per cent., rather more in times of prosperity, considerably less in times of crisis. That saturation point has now been reached in most countries of the world.'

If such be the case the indifference displayed in this country is due to the numerical insignificance of the Jews, and may easily be ended by further immigration. In certain areas, like the East End of London, where Jews are concentrated, there is pronounced anti-Semitism.

There are various possible solutions of the Jewish problem. The Germans appear to have reverted to that of the ghetto, or seclusion, for those Jews whom they have not induced to leave. The liberal solution was assimilation, but this is possible only where the Jews are few, manners are tolerant and trade prosperous, so that this solution is temporarily not feasible. The third possibility is Zionism, through which a Jewish state is to be constituted, preferably in Palestine. But objections to this exist. There are no convenient uninhabited lands without owners to object. Nor would it be possible to collect all the Jews in the world and constitute them into one state. To set up a Jewish state containing only some of the Jews would merely aggravate the problem. The fourth solution is that of sterilisation or race suicide. Mr. Smith refers to the alarming decline in the Jewish birth-rate, but fails to indicate who is alarmed. Hitherto the Jews have been able to increase in spite of pogroms and slum life only through a high birth-rate, which remains high among orthodox Jews. Were the Jews to reduce their birth-rate well below the level obtaining in the country of their adoption, they would soon become a diminishing and negligible quantity. The Jewish problem is essentially the simple one of the uninvited guest: he may either remove himself or be removed. It is pleasanter for both sides if he removes himself. P. R. Smythe.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of *The Modern Churchman*

Sir,

WHY WE OUGHT TO LOVE THE JEWS

As a former Diocesan Sunday School organiser, may I suggest to parents and teachers amongst your readers a way in which we can help to promote better understanding between Christians and Jews in this terrible time of Jewish persecution?

There is no doubt that much prejudice exists against Jews even in this country, and is in large measure due to ignorance and misunderstanding, which can so easily be worked upon to create anti-semitism.

Many useful cheap books have been published lately which should help to correct this ignorance: *The Jewish Problem,* by Louis Golding (Penguin); *The Jews of Britain,* by Salomon (Hutchinson); *Youth and Anti-Semitism,* by Simpson (Epworth Press).

Parents and teachers, both Day and Sunday School, can however do very much more, if they will, to foster better understanding and sympathy and to correct the prejudice which still exists in some people's minds against Jews as 'those who killed Jesus.'

There is no intentional anti-semitism in the religious teaching given in our schools, but unfortunately much harm can be done with the best intentions by teachers with little knowledge of true Judaism and the Jewish background of the New Testament.

So often in the stories of our Lord, especially those of His trials and crucifixion, 'the Jews' are accused as His enemies, and the fact that He Himself was a true Jew and all His friends and followers Jews is forgotten.

Parents and teachers might help so much towards sympathy if they would remember and point out to their children that Jesus was brought up in a Jewish home, regularly attended Jewish worship and taught His followers to observe carefully the true Jewish law. 'Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.'

In dealing with the story of the Crucifixion it should be carefully pointed out that His death was caused not by *the* Jews but by some Jews who instigated the Roman rulers to crucify Him.

Above all, let us never forget that He forgave fully and prayed for those who were His enemies. 'Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.'

Most surely He would have His followers to-day treat Jews, even offending Jews, in His way, that of love and kindness, and cultivate the spirit of understanding and respect.

HELEN ELLERSHAW.

Birchwood, Jordans, Beaconsfield, Bucks.

SIR,

TOUCHING FOR THE KING'S EVIL

May I append the two following extracts to Mr. Todd's interesting article published in your March issue? The first is from Ben Jonson, the second from Samuel Johnson:

AN EPIGRAM TO KING CHARLES FOR AN HUNDRED POUNDS HE SENT ME IN MY SICKNESS (1630)

Great Charles, among the holy gifts of grace
Annexéd to thy person and thy place,
'Tis not enough (thy piety is such)
To cure the call'd King's-Evil with thy touch;
But thou wilt yet a kinglier mastery try,
To cure the Poet's-Evil, poverty:
And in these cures dost so thyself enlarge,
As thou dost cure our evil at thy charge.

. . . . . .

What can the poet wish his king may do,
But that he cure the People's Evil too?

WHEN MY EYE WAS RESTORED TO ITS USE (from *Book of Prayers*) February 15, 1756:

Almighty God, who hast restored light to my eye, and enabled me to pursue again the studies which Thou hast set before me; teach me, by the deminution of my sight, to remember that whatever I possess is Thy gift, and by its recovery, to hope for Thy mercy: and O Lord, take not Thy Holy Spirit from me; but grant that I may use Thy bounties according to Thy will, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

The Vicarage, North Somercotes, Louth, Lincs. LEONARD W. COWIE.

SIR,

ARCHBISHOP MAGEE'S *DICTUM*

In the December (1942) *Modern Churchman*, p. 197, you misquote Archbishop Magee's famous *dictum* by omitting the word 'compulsorily.' The Archbishop said in the House of Lords:

'I entertain the strongest dislike to the Permissive Bill. I cannot, perhaps, express it in a stronger form than by saying that, if I must take my choice — and such it seems to me is really the alternative offered by the Permissive Bill — whether England should be free or sober, I declare, strange as such a declaration may sound, coming from one of my profession, that I should say it would be better that England should be free than that England should be compulsorily sober. I would distinctly prefer freedom to sobriety, because with freedom we might in the end attain sobriety, but in the other alternative we should eventually lose both freedom and sobriety.'

F. W. MACCAUD.

Vancouver, B.C., Canada.

EQUALITY FOR MEN AND WOMEN IN THE MINISTRY

SIR,

In reply to your editorial note to my letter in your last issue, I should like to point out that 'expediency' is a useful word but not a satisfactory one when not *defined* in relation to existing circumstances. In all this question the outstanding and, to my mind, inexcusable fact is that the Church, or rather a majority of the authorities in the Church, prefer that urgent spiritual work should remain undone rather than that it should be done by women. I myself, and I am quite sure very many other people, fail to recognise this attitude as Christian.

THEODORA M. FAGAN.

[The charge against our Church authorities that they 'prefer that urgent spiritual work should remain undone rather than that it should be done by women' is a misrepresentation of the situation. It is as much a misrepresentation as if we were to assert that there are a number of women who will undertake no spiritual work whatsoever because they are not permitted and authorised to undertake spiritual work of every description.

The facts as regards the Ministry of Women in the Church of England are as follows:—

(1) A series of resolutions have been passed by both Houses of Convocation in the years 1939-41 authorising the institution of the Order of Deaconesses. These resolutions await their enactment in the form of a Canon. We have little doubt that this will ensue at an early date.

(2) The Deaconesses are to be appointed by the laying on of the hands of the Bishop in the Church.

(3) The duties of the Deaconess are thus described:

(i) In things both spiritual and temporal to minister to the welfare and happiness of those to whom she is sent, especially the sick.

(ii) To give instruction in the Christian faith.

(iii) Under the incumbent to prepare candidates for Baptism and Confirmation.

(iv) To assist at the administration of Holy Baptism, and when Baptism is administered privately in the absence of the Minister to be the administrant by virtue of her office.

(v) Under the incumbent to organise, superintend, and carry out the Church's work among women and children.

(vi) To pray with, and give counsel to, such women as desire help in difficulties and perplexities.

(vii) To organise and carry out social work; in colleges and in schools to have a responsible part in the education of women and of children; and to promote the welfare of women students at the universities and elsewhere.

(4) Her ministerial status is recognised by the following resolutions:

(*a*) 'That there should be assigned to the Deaconess, by virtue of her office, a distinctive seat in church.'

(*b*) 'That she may be properly addressed as "Reverend."'

(*c*) 'That she should wear a special dress or emblem.'

(*d*) 'That where a Deaconess is licensed to a parish she should be regarded as an ordained member of the parish staff.'

Further particulars about the Order of Deaconesses can be obtained from the Rev. Edith Banks, The House of St. Joseph, Hindhead, Surrey.

ED., *M.C.*]

IMMORTALITY AND DUALISM.

SIR,

What follows is prompted by 'If a Man Die . . . ' by Rev. Canon J. S. Bezzant, and the review of John Hadham's, 'Between God and Man,' by J.C.H. Canon Bezzant quotes Goethe as saying 'That man is dead even in this life who has no belief in any other,' and J.C.H. quotes from 'Between God and Man.' 'If sin separates man from God, suffering separates God from man. If man needs to apologise to God for his failures to be perfect, God needs to apologise to man for the fact that in the world which He, not man, made, undeserved and bitter suffering is constantly taking place.' And from the same book with reference to creeds old and new, 'For a period it will be necessary to recognise that men may come together for work and worship united only by sincerity and by the belief that there is a creative power behind the world, and a purpose in life; and that nothing is to be gained by demanding of them the repetition of words in which they cannot sincerely believe.' 'I believe in God the Father, Almighty, maker of Heaven and Earth' . . . Suppose two First causes instead of one, one Good (God), the other Evil (the Devil), each almighty except against the power of the other, then God need not be blamed for the undeserved and bitter suffering that is constantly taking place in the world. Is not the interplay of these two great forces of good and evil enough to account for everything created, seen and unseen, material and non-material, temporal and eternal? In man the struggle reaches its greatest height, and by his response to the good or the evil within him and without, so during his lifetime his original stock of good and evil is increased or decreased accordingly. At death the body releases this undying mixture of good and evil which, separating, go their several ways back to the sources (God and the Devil) from which they came. There is immortality.

B. C. FORDER.

Yeoleaze,
Bradford Abbas,
Sherborne,
29/3/43. Dorset.

[The existence of evil in the universe is a perennial problem of our philosophers and theologians. When the great eighth century prophets (Amos and his successors) gave Israel a theology, that theology was Monist. In it the one God (Yahweh) was postulated as the source both of good and evil. When the Jews, as the result of the Persian conquest, came under the influence of Zoroastrianism, the most influential of their religious teachers, the Pharisees (or Persianists as they were nicknamed) became Dualist in their theology and tended to identify Yahweh with Ormuz, the God of Light, and Satan (the Adversary) was introduced into Jewish religion as the equivalent of Ahriman, the God of Darkness. This Dualism passed into the Christian religion and constitutes (with variations) orthodox Christian belief. For the most part, Christians have accepted this Dualism in the form in which Milton presents it in *Paradise Lost*. In the early centuries of our era, Gnostic Christians attempted a solution of this Dualism and identified the source of Evil with Matter. The Christian Church condemned, as heretical, the Gnostic solution. Modern Christian theologians have sought to explain evil as a necessary by-product of the creative process which will disappear from the Universe when the creative process is itself completed. It seems clear that there is endless opportunity for speculation in dealing with this problem.

The Christian religion offers, not a speculative, but a practical solution, when it teaches that for Man, Eternal life, which excludes all sin and suffering, is only to be secured in perfect obedience to the Will of God made known to Man through Christ.—ED. *M.C.*]

SPIRITUAL CHRISTIANITY AND SOUTH INDIA.

Sir,

The recent discussions in the Press as to the recognition or otherwise by the Church of England of the proposed United Church of South India are clear evidence of the hindrances which centuries of ecclesiasticism have strewn in the way of spiritual life, and of the first-hand Christianity of the Gospels. The terms which Christ used in regard to Himself (the Vine, the Light, the Bread of Life) all testify to the ample abundance of that life and to the fact that it is available at all times and everywhere — not something hard to come at, nor reserved, as it were, under lock and key, and available, for the most part, only through the ministrations of an episcopally ordained ministry. If there is to be a great re-setting of human life, a new rush of spiritual quality and richness into this darkened world, it can only be as we each severally learn to reach out for and drink in this Eternal Life as all-encompassing and urgent as the air we breathe.

Is not Immanence — the essence of all that the name Emmanuel implies — the very core of the original, unedited Christianity of Jesus Christ, the fundamental fact on which all genuine unity of faith and worship must rest? Without that Indwelling, consciously recognized, religion is sterile, a mere matter of intellect with none of the dynamic drive of the God-possessed.

To teach men and women to become fitted for that Immanence, to become receptive of it and to live in the power of it is (it can scarcely be disputed) the very core of the Church's work and its inescapable responsibility — not to be obscured and crowded out by undue reverence 'for the authority of the past' or by a rigid adherence to historic forms and ritual. We must somehow break through that hard carapace of traditionalism which stiffens us so effectually against the call for fresh attitudes of mind and soul. In this struggle we need leaders with ever-widening vision, and warmth of human sympathy to attract the multitudes of seeking souls, who at present feel themselves outsiders in any Church. Christ's term for the universal Church was 'one Flock' (*Jn.* x, 16, R.V.), to which He declared all welcome who heard His voice and followed Him. Here is no suggestion of any obstacle to entrance, no hint of that exclusiveness which breathes to-day through so much of the ecclesiastical press. Therein lies the hindrance to the unity to which the Church of South India is feeling its way, and if it seeks to enlarge its borders and to become more widely welcoming, shall other Churches look askance?

Dalston Hall,
nr. Carlisle.
May 13, 1943.

Beatrice E. Morton.

AMERICAN RELIGIOUS BOOKS IN ENGLAND

Sir,

The following additional information to that given in the March *Modern Churchman* review of American books recently published may, I hope, be of use to your readers:

Meister Eckhart, translated by C. de B. Evans, published by John M. Watkins (London). Vol. I in 1924, Vol. II in 1931.

Adams Brown's *A Creed for Free Men* appeared in S.C.M. Religious Book Club, as did Paton's *The Church and the New Order.*

L. E. Elliott-Binns.

The Vicarage, Newton St. Cyres, Exeter.